

4

Constitution in Church and State.

T H R E E
S E R M O N S

Preached on Occasion of the
PRESENT REBELLION,

A T

St. Ann's Limehouse, and the Chapel of Poplar,

In Sept. and Oct. 1745.

By **GLOCESTER RIDLEY, LL. B.**

Published at the Request of the PARISHIONERS.

L O N D O N :

Printed for JOHN CLARKE, under the Royal Ex-
change, Cornhill. MDCCLVI.

Price One Shilling.

Constitution in Church and State

THE

SEYMOUR'S

Practical Christianity

PRESENT REVELATION

OF THE

THE

LONDON

Printed by John G. & Co. at the Press of the
London Convention

1844

Rev
The
in a
the
in G
the
Tri
Y
Pos
pre
wh
dra
fre



S E R M O N I.

REV. ii. 5.

Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent.

ABOUT 200 Years ago the Church of England was corrupted with many and great Errors in Doctrine, and Worship. These Errors it's Spiritual Governors did reform in a national Synod, confirmed and established by the Civil Power. One would think, that They in so doing, and We, in obeying them who have the Rule over us, stand fully justified before every Tribunal, to which we can be accountable.

Yet we find that *another* Church, and a *foreign* Power has presumed to call us into Judgment, pretending Commission from Christ: By virtue of which, it has imperiously pronounced Sentence, drawing against us the *Spiritual* Sword, to destroy our Souls in Hell; and the *Civil* Sword, to dispossess

dispossess our Princes of their Dominions, their faithful People of their Properties, and Both of their Lives.

An unhappy Situation we are in! Christ threatens to remove the Gospel-light, and leave no Means of Grace, or Hopes of Glory among us, unless we reform ourselves by the primitive Plan, *and repent, and do the first Works*: At the same time the Church of Rome pretends Commission from the same Christ to plunder, and murder, and damn us if we do. Surely either We, or They are mistaken; and it is a matter of Consequence to discover which is so.

That a particular Christian Church, even though it might once justly boast of it's Purity and Perfection, and, if any ever could, of being *the Pillar and Ground of the Truth*, may possibly fall into Errors, and fatal ones, is evident from the Text; such a Church, I say, *may* fall, for *Ephesus did*. In which case, it is farther plain, that it is the Duty of those Governors, to whose Care that particular Church is committed, to trace out the original, primitive Institution, and regulate their Charge by that; the Elder of the Church of *Ephesus* is directed and enjoined to *remember from whence he was fallen, to repent, and to do the first works*. The neglect to do so is threatened with the Danger of being totally forsaken of God, and losing the gracious Light of the Gospel; *or else, I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of it's place, unless thou repent*: And History informs us how punctually this Threat has been executed; inasmuch, that there is not one Christian Family left in *Ephesus*.*

* Mr. Rycant's *Present State of the Greek Church*.

The Enquiries then, which it behoves us to make, are these Three;

I. Whether those Points in *Doctrine* and *Worship*, which we suspected, and complained of, were really Errors, and Corruptions of the original Plan, or not?

II. Whether by reforming manifest Errors, without leave from the Church of *Rome*, we are guilty of Schism, and thereby stand justly exposed to the Sentence of Excommunication, and Damnation?

III. Whether, moreover, our Princes and their Subjects have thereby, according to God's Word, forfeited their Possessions and Lives?

FIRST, let us enquire, whether those Points in *Doctrine* and *Worship*, which we suspected, and complained of, were really Errors and Corruptions of the original Plan, or not?

I. Among the Errors in *Doctrine*,

1. That challenges our first regard, which is the leading Lye in the System, the Mother and Nurse of all the rest, the *Infallibility* of the Church of *Rome*. While this was believed among us, it threw a Veil over the Understanding, and prevented the clearly discerning other suspected Points. If this is established, farther Enquiry will be impertinent; for in vain shall we go about to prove those *Doctrines* erroneous, which we received from a Church that cannot err. To secure this Foundation, they refer us to the following Scriptures; Our Saviour promised, *MATT. xviii. 20. Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them.* St. Paul says, *1 TIM. iii. 15. The Church is the Pillar and Ground of the Truth.* And enjoins, *HEB. xiii. 17.*

Obey them that have the Rule over you, and submit yourselves. And Christ commands, *MATT. xviii. 17.* *If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen Man, and a Publican.* Now in these Texts I hear not one Word of the Church of *Rome*: and if they prove *Infallibility* in that particular Church, they will equally prove *Infallibility* in every other particular Christian Church in the World; for these Scriptures are equally true, and prove as much in one Church as another. But we learn from the Text, that the Church of *Ephesus* had erred; we know from Ecclesiastical History, that the Church of *Hierusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch* have erred: so also we think it possible, notwithstanding the above Passages, that the Church of *Rome* may err, even in Matters of Faith.

Other Authorities from Scripture to the same Purpose, I wave, as proving nothing particularly of the Church of *Rome*; and proceed to examine two, which they urge with great Contention, and triumph, as direct and full Evidences in Point. The one is from *MATT. xvi. 18.* *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church: and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.* But if these Words refer to the Confession, which St. Peter had just made, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God*; then they only prove the infallible Truth of that Confession, the Foundation of Christian Faith, on which Christ would build his Church, and against which, *the Gates of Hell, or Death, should not prevail*: though they opened to receive it's Professors successively, yet the Profession itself should continue and militate, in spite of all Opposition, to the End of Time; nor should those Gates be able to detain it's dead Professors from rising triumphant to receive their Crown of Glory.

Glory. How then does the Promise of the perpetual Continuance of this Faith to be professed upon Earth, prove the Infallibility of the Pope of Rome? And, besides that the Stream of Interpreters take that way, we have Authority for that Interpretation, which should silence a *Popish* Objector, several Popes^b, who so expound the Passage. Wherefore if those Popes did not err in their Interpretation, then this Text proves not that Infallibility, which they would now build upon it: If they mistook the Meaning of the Text, then their wrong Interpretation proves the Pope fallible.

The other Authority from Scripture is, *LUKE* xxii. 32. where our Saviour says to *Peter*, *I have prayed for thee, that thy Faith fail not; and when thou art converted, strengthen thy Brethren.* In the Context we find, that Christ was with the Twelve, whom^c, he says, Satan had desired to sift: but I have prayed for Thee, that Thy Faith fail not. *Peter* plainly understood the Words as a Reproach; "Why so diffident of Me?" Lord, I am ready to go with thee both into prison, and to death. But to correct his mistaken Confidence, our Saviour rejoins, *I tell thee, Peter, the Cock shall not crow this day, before that thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me.* Such was the Occasion of the Words, such *Peter's* Frailty, beyond the rest of the Apostles, notwithstanding his own good Opinion of himself, and the Prayers of Christ in his behalf. The Words are no Argument of a particular Privilege granted to *Peter*, but of a particular Distrust and Diffidence in him.

^b *Felix* III. A. D. 526. Super istâ confessione ædificabo ecclesiam meam. Upon that Confession will I build my Church. And so interpret five more Popes. See *SER.* II.

^c *Ἰπὸς τὸ σινδόν*, to sift You in the plural Number, i. e. all of you.

Now should we argue thus; *St. Peter* was weaker in the Faith than the rest of the Apostles, basely denied his Master, and forswore him, therefore the Pope of *Rome* is less faithful than other Christian Bishops, and more apt to secure himself by Perjury, though to the Dishonour of Christ; they, I presume, would scoff at our Argument; for should the Conclusion by Accident prove true in Fact, yet would it not necessarily be good in Logic. So although these Texts proved (which they do not) Infallibility in the Person of *St. Peter*, what is that to the Bishop of *Rome*? Will the Apostle's Spirit accompany the Mantle which he never wore, or the Chair in which he never sat? for even the Pope's Succession to *Peter* is greatly questioned, and denied by many, while the *Roman Catholics* themselves allow it to the Bishops of *Antioch*; *They* therefore, if Succession to *St. Peter* gives it, have the unquestionable Title to his Infallibility: But *They* have erred. What Credulity then must it be, to invest his disputed Successors at *Rome* with a Prerogative, by virtue of their Succession to him, which his undoubted Successors at *Antioch* never enjoyed?

So that no Authority of *Scripture* lies in the way to prevent our farther Enquiry into *Facts*, to see how well they maintain this Point. And here with all the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*, they are not able to tell us where it lies. Sometimes they assert it is in the Pope; sometimes in a General Council; sometimes in a General Council confirmed by the Pope. This looks very suspiciously at first setting out; they are sure they have Infallibility somewhere among them, but know not where to find it. Not unlike the Man who had an *Excellent Art of Memory*, but had forgot where he had laid the Book.

For

For *Popes*: some have been Hereticks, Schismatics, and Infidels; condemned for Heresy in General Councils, and those Councils confirmed by Popes; they have contradicted one another, and themselves; more than one have condemned the Title of *Universal Bishop* as profane and anti-christian, another forbid as a grand Sacrilege the communicating in one Kind only, both which Points their infallible Church has since decreed are Errors: Themselves therefore being Judges, we cannot find Infallibility in the Person of the Pope. For *General Councils*: the Church of *Rome* rejects and reprobates several of them; and therefore must admit that they may err. But where both concur, a *General Council confirmed by the Pope*, there, or no where, must we expect to find this glorious Privilege. But, alas! these have contradicted one another, even in the very Point of Infallibility: The Council of *Constance*, confirmed by *Martin V.*, decreed that a General Council was superior to the Pope, and the last *Lateran Council*, confirmed by *Leo X.*, condemned that Decree. The political, but irreligious Use of Infallibility, was to give them Dominion over the Faith of the whole World, and rule it as they pleased.

This *Prejudice* being removed out of the Way, we may proceed without Fear to examine any Point, which we suspect to be erroneous, and try it by the Truth of the Scriptures.

2. Such a one our Reformers apprehended *Transubstantiation* to be; a hard Word, by which was meant, that the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament of *the Lord's Supper*, is changed into the very real Substance of Christ's Body and Blood, contrary to the notorious Evidence of our Senses. But the Words of Institution, say they, are express, *Jesus took Bread, and said, THIS IS MY BODY*;

and he took the Cup, saying, **THIS IS MY BLOOD**, MATT. xxvi. 26, 28. We think, that these Words ought to be understood *figuratively*, because *literally taken* they are absurd; that the like Figure is frequent; and that it was easy to be understood by his Disciples, who were *Jews*: Their annual Paschal Supper, which Christ at this very Time celebrated, was called *The Sacrifice of the Lord's Passover*, EXOD. xii. 27.⁴ Our Saviour instead of the *Paschal*, now instituted *his* Supper, and taking Bread called it *His Body*, intending it for the *Memorial* of His Body, which was *our Passover*, that was sacrificed for us, 1 COR. v. 7. The *Roman Catholics* clamorously insist upon the *Letter*: Let them then apply the like Interpretation to the like Expressions elsewhere; *The Church which is Christ's Body*, EPHES. i. 23. *That Rock was Christ*, ROM. xiii. 1. Will they thence infer that the Rock in the Wilderness, and the Congregations of Christian People are changed into the very real Substance of Christ's Body? If such Expressions prove not Transubstantiation in these Instances, neither will they necessarily prove it in the former. Nay, if they will admit of no Figure in the Words of Institution, then is there no Transubstantiation in the *Wine*, but the *Cup* is changed into the Blood of Christ, for so the literal Expression would prove; *He took the Cup, saying, This is my Blood*. So that the Letter will not prove *their* Transubstantiation, nor the true Meaning of the Words *any* Transubstantiation at all; for after this supposed Change, our Saviour calls what was in the Cup, *This fruit*

⁴ מַצֵּה נֶאֱמַר מִצֵּה. The Vulg. neglects מִצֵּה. Hoc, Victimam transitus Domini est. But Vatablus corrects it, Mac-tatio Paschæ Hæc Domino. This is the Sacrifice of the Lord's Passover. מצה נֶאֱמַר מִצֵּה TOTTO נֶאֱמַר מִצֵּה Septuag.

of the Vine, MATT. xxvi. 29. and St. Paul what had been broke, *This Bread*, 1 COR. xi. 26. And one of their own Popes, *Gelasius*, in the 5th Century, says, "The Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ are a divine Thing, by them we are made Partakers of a divine Nature; yet the Substance or Nature of Bread and Wine does not cease." Nor did this monstrous Opinion appear till the 8th Century, nor was it determined for Truth till the Year 1215. Their own Writers admit it cannot be proved by Scripture, and resolve it's Truth into a Decree of Pope and Council. But *their* Fallibility has been seen under the former Head; their Authority therefore is not sufficient to make us swallow such Absurdities. A few of them be pleased to hear, as themselves report them, under the bright Display of *Miracles* wrought in the Holy Eucharist.

"Christ is bodily present in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, while his same Body remains in Heaven, and never moves from thence. Christ's whole Body with all it's Quantity is in the Host, though the Host be much less than his Body: Nay, the same whole Body is all in every Host; aye, and whole in every Part of every Host throughout the Earth. Neither is Christ's Body in the Eucharist without it's sensible Qualities, although those Qualities are not perceivable by our Senses.

"The Bread and Wine are annihilated; yet the Taste, Smell, Colour, Figure, and other Accidents continue the same as if the Bread and Wine were really there; which are but Illusions, only the Shades and Apparitions of the departed Elements. Notwithstanding which, they have the same natural Virtue to nourish, strengthen,

“ strengthen, and increase the Bodies of the Re-
 “ ceivers as their original Substances had.

“ If Worms, or other little Animals are form-
 “ ed in the Host kept so long as to be corrupted,
 “ they are not quite agreed how they could come
 “ there; but are perfectly clear, that either God
 “ creates a new Matter on Purpose; or is at the
 “ Expence of as great a Miracle, in restoring such
 “ Quantity of the annihilated Bread as is sufficient
 “ for their Production *?”

These strange Consequences follow, by their own
 Confession, from the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*.
 But they, taking that Point for granted, because
 decreed in their Church, consecrate these Conclu-
 sions into *Miracles*. We leave them, as we find
 them, *Impossibilities* and *Absurdities*: Which, as
 they are supported by *Infallibility*, for they are re-
 ceived only upon the Authority of the Church;
 so they return the Compliment, and by setting a-
 side the Evidences of Reason, and the Senses, sup-
 port *Infallibility*.

3. Another Objection was urged, against their
 forbidding Marriage to the Clergy: But in this
 Point their own Doctors are not agreed, whether
 it be of *Divine*, or *Apostolical*, or only *Ecclesiastical*
 Institution. If only the *latter*, the particular
 Church of *England* has more Right to restore the
 natural Liberty of Marriage, than the particular
 Church of *Rome* had to take it away. For the
former, no Proofs from Scripture are pretended.
 So that only that Opinion needs Examination,
 which supposes it of *Apostolical* Institution. And
 here they are greatly at a loss for Arguments, but
 never fail to amuse us with the 7th Chap. of 1 Cor.

* The Purport of the Jesuit *Perrinus* in Joan. vi.

Upon which one or two Observations will be sufficient; 1st, That those Exhortations are directed to *all* Christian People, Laity as well as Clergy, and leave us in Possession of this Argument, that the Clergy are *no more* forbidden Marriage by St. Paul, than the Laity. 2^{dly}, That Marriage is enjoined to prevent Fornication, when Men cannot contain they must marry, 1 COR. vii. 2. 9. Our Allowance of Marriage rather than Fornication, is therefore certainly more Apostolical, than their Allowance of Fornication, and even the most abominable Lusts, rather than Wedlock: For a Pope has been found, who out of the Fulness of Apostolick Power, granted a Licence for Sodomy¹. If we enquire into Apostolical *Example*, St. Peter himself was a married Man; for we read of his Wife's Mother in three Evangelists. If into Apostolical *Counsel*, St. Paul says, *A Bishop must be blameless, the Husband of one Wife, having his Children in Subjection with all Gravity*, 1 TIM. iii. 2. 4. *Likewise if any be blameless, the Husband of one Wife, having faithful Children*, he was fit to be an Elder, TIT. i. 6. *And let the Deacons be the Husbands of one Wife, ruling their Children, and their own Houses well*, 1 TIM. iii. 12. This Doctrine therefore is not only *not proved* by Scripture, but is *contrary* to it; and has been the Occasion of so many shameful Abominations among their *Religious*, that we may venture, upon the Authority of the same Apostle, who wrote to the *Corinthians*, to reckon *forbidding to marry among the Doctrines of Devils*, 1 TIM. iv. 1. But how devilish so ever it might be in it's immoral Tendencies, yet it was advantageous towards their secular Interests; therefore not

[*Sextus* IV. circa A. D. 1430.

to be reformed: as an unmarried Clergy were at Liberty to apply their Cares, Attention, and Revenues to aggrandise and enrich the Church; so their unnatural Vows, however ill-kept, were serviceable to maintain

4. The profitable Doctrines of *Merit*, and *Supererogation*; which these unnatural Votaries lay chief Claim to, and so abound in, as to afford cheap Pennyworths to those who want them. However the Doctrine itself, without considering its lucrative Views, is to be first examined: We judged it ought to be reformed. We will express it in the Words of one of their Doctors, "The good Works of just Men are meritorious of eternal Life *condignly*," (or from their own intrinsic Worth,) although "there was no divine compact^s." This we condemn, as contrary to Scripture, which says, *our Goodness extends not to God.* PSALM xvi. 2. *If thou be righteous what givest thou him? or what receiveth He of thine Hand?* JOB xxxv. 7. It is impossible for the Creature to benefit or advantage his perfect and all-sufficient Creator. Wherefore our Saviour teaches us to acknowledge, that *when we have done all, we are unprofitable Servants.* Nay without the Word *unprofitable*, which the *Æthiopic* Version omits, the acknowledging ourselves God's *Servants* is sufficient to destroy the Notion of *this Merit*. For Servants, or Bondmen, were their Master's Property, to whom they owed all the Service of their Lives, and for which they were not

^s Cajetan. in l. 2. qu. 11. part. 3. These Words are chosen as expressing with great Brevity and Clearness the general Opinion of the Church of *Rome*; but in Justice to the Author of them it should be mentioned, that he altered his own Opinion in this Point, and died at last, as to this Particular, a true *Reformed*.

entitled to any Wages or Reward. To this our Saviour seems to refer in the Place, *Does he thank that Servant because he did the Things that were commanded him? I trow not. So likewise Ye, when ye have done all those Things that are commanded you, say, We are SERVANTS, or Bondmen, we have done that, which was our Duty to do.* In this Sense St. Paul uses the Word; *Though I be free from All Men; under no Obligation to spend my Time and Labour without Recompence in the Service of any Man, yet I have made myself SERVANT to all, i. e.* I have preached to you without any Wages, as if I had been your Bondman, bound to serve you, but entitled to no Reward for it. 1 COR. ix. 19. Such Servants to God we are, both by *Birth* and *Purchase*, by Creation and Redemption. And when *whatever Things are true—best—just—pure—lovely—and of good Report* are enjoined us PHIL. iv. 8. I think it difficult for a good Man to do more than was his Duty to do. Whoever in the Church of Rome does so, it must be deducted from the Value of his good Works, as an Act of Disobedience, not added to it as superabundant Merit. And if the Notion of Merit to any Reward at all be destroyed, how much more indefensible is the Notion of meriting by our Works so great and disproportioned a Recompence as the Reward of eternal Life? which accordingly the Scriptures represent as *the Gift of God*, and not a *Debt* to Man. The Application of the more than necessary Merit of some religious Orders to the Necessities of those who had rather part with their Money than their Sins, is a Doctrine very convenient for the Profit of the Monks, and the Peace of Sinners. But lest any should take it into their Heads to merit for themselves, and get to Heaven without paying for it, they throw in their Way

5. The Doctrine of Purgatory; which we see no Reason to receive. What they mean by it, the Bishop of *Meaux* will tell us; "Those who depart this Life in Grace and Charity, but nevertheless indebted to the Divine Justice some Pains which it reserved, are to suffer them in the other Life. This, says he, is what the Council of *Trent* proposes to our Belief, touching the Souls detained in Purgatory." As we think this is highly derogatory from the all-sufficient Merits and Satisfaction of Christ's Death for our Redemption, which was to cleanse us from all Sin, 1 JOH. i. 7. and present us unblameable and irreproveable, COL. i. 22: So we cannot help demanding full and positive Proof from Scripture, before we give our Assent. In their Harangues they can string you up 19 several Texts from both Testaments, as *Bellarmino* has done. All which are soon answered. *Bellarmino* himself rejects one of them as impertinent; and another of their own Writers ^a rejects 16 more of them; so that we have but two left. And the first of these is *Apocryphal*,² *Macc.* xii. 43. Which Book the *Jews* never received as canonical, nor the Christian Church for the first 600 Years; we will therefore venture to set aside its Authority. The only one which remains is *MATH.* xii. 32. The Sin against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven, neither in this World, neither in the World to come. Whence they would infer that some Sins pardoned here, shall be punished hereafter. But why by the temporary Punishment of Purgatory? if they will compare *MARK* iii. 29. with that Passage, their Inference must be, some Sins pardoned here, shall be punished with eternal Damnation hereafter:

^a *Alexander Natalis.*

Which is no Proof of *Purgatory*. They must therefore find out some other Meaning of that Disjunction, *neither in this World, neither in that to come*, for it will not support their Inference. And indeed *Bellarmino* confesses, that according to the Rules of Logic, *Purgatory* cannot be inferred from hence. Nay this Doctrine is so far from being proved by Scripture, that it is against it. The sacred Writings represent the State of those, who depart this Life in Grace far otherwise. *The Voice from Heaven*, if the Church of *Rome* gives any Credit to that, says, *Blessed are the Dead, which die in the Lord, FROM HENCEFORTH, yea saith the Spirit, that they may REST from their Labours.* REV. xiv. 13. Can this Rest mean the Tortures of *Purgatory*? St. Paul says, *We know that if our earthly House of this Tabernacle were dissolved, we have a Building with God, a House not made with Hands, eternal in the Heavens. When we are absent from the Body, we are present with the Lord.* 2 COR. v. 1. 8. Here is no mention of Pains and *Purgatory*, no intermediate House of Correction betwixt *this Tabernacle dissolved*, and *the building with God eternal in the Heavens*. Consult Parables, consult Facts, all concur in this Doctrine; *Lazarus* from the rich Man's Door, where he died, was carried into *Abraham's Bosom*; *The Penitent Thief was lifted from the Cross into Paradise. For which Reason, agreeably to the Sentiments of the Primitive Church, we are directed in our Burial-Office, not to mourn, but rejoice at the Death of a Christian Brother, on this Assurance, that "the Souls of the Faithful, after they are delivered from the Burthen of the Flesh, are in Joy and Felicity."—not going to be tormented in *Purgatory*. But it is too serviceable an Engine to be laid aside merely for being *anti-scriptural*; and they will continue to support it,

it, because, in Conjunction with the preceding one of *Merit*, it supports

6. That gainful Doctrine of *Indulgences*; a Corruption of the primitive Church Discipline, which imposed long and severe Penances upon scandalous Offenders; the Rigour of which, upon weighty Considerations, was sometimes moderated by the Bishop: and this Relaxation was called an *Indulgence*. But the Popish Indulgences are very different Things: they suppose a Treasure in the Church made up of the Merits of Christ, and the Saints, which is wholly at the Pope's Disposal, and which he dispenses to others, at what Price he can get, to discharge them from those temporal Punishments to which they are obnoxious for their venial Sins in Purgatory. They pretend neither Scripture, nor ancient Doctors in Support of this iniquitous Scheme: for *iniquitous* I may be allowed to call it, since the Council of *Trent* itself confesses "horrible Abuses in the Sale of Indulgences." They acknowledge, that for ought they can find, Indulgences were not so much as thought on till about the 12th Century. Against this shameful Merchandize many of themselves exclaim. "O Rome, says one, sing and rejoice, for thou hast that which thou hast always thirsted after; thou hast conquered the World, not by Religion, but by the Wickedness of Men: That it is which draws them to thee, not their Devotion and Piety." And the Princes of *Germany* complained of them as Cheats. Nay their principal Advocate himself, "would not have the People too confident of the Effect of Indulgences: for though the Church," says he, may have Power to give them, yet they

¹ Conrad Uspersgenus.

² Bellarmine.

" may

" may want their Effect in particular Persons.
 " And therefore all *prudent Christians* do so receive
 " Indulgences, as withal to satisfy God themselves
 " for their Sins." After these frank Declarations
 of their own, we should be Fools indeed to press
 into their Church, only for the Privilege of being
 bubbled.

To attempt reckoning up all the Errors of the
 Church of *Rome*, would be almost *endless*, and after
 these already mentioned, I persuade myself, *need-*
less; for these, I think, are sufficient to shew that
 we had derived from *Rome* many gross Errors,
 which needed Reformation; and to secure you a-
 gainst any Desire of quitting your own Church, from
 an Expectation of purer Doctrines in Theirs. But
 if you proceed

II. To examine some Points of their religious
Worship, you will be still more convinced, that
 they had introduced among us Errors and Corrup-
 tions, that we lay under the strictest Obligations to
 reform.

1. One is a General Corruption, which runs
 through, and affects their whole Service, its being
 performed in an *unknown Tongue*, expressly con-
 demned by St. Paul, 1 COR. xiv. 14. *If I pray in*
an unknown Tongue, my Spirit prayeth, but my Un-
derstanding is unfruitful. In Answer to this, some
 of them tell us, That the Apostle "condemns a bar-
 "barous, and utterly extraneous Tongue, which
 "nobody understood, as *Arabic* and *Persic*; but
 "not that which is understood by learned and ci-
 "vil People in every great City, as *Hebrew*, *Greek*
 "and *Latin*!" The Apostle speaks in general of
 all Tongues not understood by the People, and

¹ *Billarmins*, and the *Rhemist* Annotat.

where *Latin* is such a one, as I am sure it is in *England*, there *Latin* is as much condemned as *Arabic* and *Persic*. Another tells us, what the Apostle says "is to be referred to the State of that Time, " which is much unlike the State of the Church " we be now in; *They* needed Instruction, *We* be " not ignorant of the chief Points of Religion ". We do not find Fault with their Knowledge, but their Ignorance; and that they make that Ignorance the Mother and Nurse of their Devotion. Notwithstanding all their other Knowledge, yet if they pray in an unknown Tongue, *though the Spirit prayeth, their Understanding*, great as they suppose it, is *unfruitful*: In this Objection we blame their Ignorance in Prayer, and call not into Question their Skill in the chief Points of Religion. We are at other Times amused with a Saying of *Anthony of Padua*, " That is a perfect Prayer, in " which the Mind is so swallowed up into God, " that it doth not understand its own Words." But *St. Paul*, whose Authority weighs more with us, prefers the praying *with the Spirit*, and *the praying with the Understanding also*. *y. 15*. Well then, they will allow us this, concerning *private* Prayer, and tell us, that " no Catholick denies that it is very " expedient that every Man pray in his own " Tongue, to the End he may understand what he " says; but *public* Prayer the Priest saith in the " Name and Person of the whole Church ".— And " there is no need that the People should understand it, in order to their profiting by it." But *St. Paul* was of another Opinion, as he plainly shews by asking, (which is equally applicable to publick Prayer, as well as *Praise*,) *When*

^a Harding.

^b Touchstone of the Reformed Gospel.

^c Bellarmine De Verbo Dei. lib. 2. c. p. 16.

thou shalt bless with the Spirit, how shall he that occupieth the Place of the Unlearned, say Amen at thy giving of Thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? for thou verily givest Thanks well, but the other is not edified. *Y.* 16, 17. He doth not give Thanks well. So vain are all their Shifts and Evasions, that at last they speak out boldly, and like themselves in the Plenitude of more than Apostolical Power, "The Church doth not at all offend" in departing from this Institution of *St. Paul*, it "being left free to the Church, not only to violate this Institution of *St. Paul*, but also the Institution of GOD HIMSELF, supposing it to have been once profitable to the Church, but now to be unprofitable." And this last is a Point, which they had much rather *suppose*, than *prove*. Wherefore our Consciences can never reproach us, neither can the Catholicks (as they call themselves) with any Shadow of Decency blame us, for departing from the Practice of their Church in this Instance, as we did it only to return to our first Works, the Practice of the Primitive Apostolical Church, from which here they acknowledge themselves to have faln and departed.

2. In the Service of the Blessed *Eucharist* we found ourselves involved in no less Sins than *Impiety*, *Idolatry*, and *Sacrilege*. Hard Charges upon those, who still retain the same Service! Happy for them, if upon Examination they prove not to be true!

But the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass is certainly *impious*; for therein they profess truly and properly to sacrifice Christ, that is, as they define

a Sacrifice, to kill him, and put him to Death; and as they plainly assert Christ is every Day by the Mass-Priest. We shall acquit them of the *Fals*, because Transubstantiation is not true: and if Scripture was necessary to support the Testimony of our Senses, St. Paul tells us, that *AS it is appointed to Men once i. e. but once to die; SO Christ was once i. e. but once offered to bear the Sins of Many*. HEBR. ix. 27, 28. But they avow the *Intention*, when under the Forms of Bread and Wine, they believe, and mean to offer Christ's Body and Blood to God, as truly as Christ once offered himself upon the Cross; and that this is as truly a proper and propitiatory Sacrifice as the other. This is not only *false*, but *impious*; we therefore rank it among *blasphemous Fables*; and as such, esteem it a *dangerous Deceit*. The *Coribaginians* were found inhuman enough to sacrifice their Children to *Saturn*: but to sacrifice their God!—This was an *Absurdity*, which no Faith could digest, but the implicit one of *Rome*; an *Impiety*, which no Religion could design, but that of *Antichrist*!

Nor is the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass more *impious*, than their Adoration of the consecrated Bread in the Eucharist is *idolatrous*. If the Bread and Wine are not really changed into the very Substance of Christ's Body and Blood, they themselves subscribe to this Charge: And that there is no such substantial Change wrought, our Senses and Reason assure us; nor is there any Authority produced to contradict this Testimony, but a Decree of the Council of *Trent*; and the Honour of such Contra-

* Bellarmine de Missa. lib. 1. cap. 2. & cap. 27. & Catechism. ad Parochos, Sacerdotes instituit, ut corpus ejus immolarent. p. 215.

† Articl. of Relig. 31.

dition we deny them not. However upon their own Principles, they will stand convicted: For, together with the Body and Blood of Christ, which they believe to be there substantially, they acknowledge there are also the Accidents or Species of Bread and Wine, which make a Part of their Object of Adoration; wherefore they worship, if not the Bread and Wine, (as we say,) yet, (as themselves say,) something of less Value, the Forms and Shadows of them. Farther, none can be sure, that he does not worship meer Bread and Wine, (I mean still upon their own Principles;) for, the making them into a God, depends upon the Consecration of the Elements, and that depends upon the Intention of the Priest, as they teach, and even the Worth of that Intention depends upon the Validity of his *Orders and Baptism*. " Let there be then, (it is a
 " Case of their own putting*, in the Debate at the
 " Council of *Trent*,) a Knave-Priest who faineth, and
 " hath not an Intention to administer the true Bap-
 " tism to a Child, who, after being a Man grown, is
 " created Bishop of a great City, and liveth many
 " Years in that Change, so that he hath ordained
 " a great Part of the Priests: It must be said, that
 " he being not baptized, is not ordained, nor they
 " ordained who are promoted by him. So, in that
 " great City, there will be neither Eucharist, nor
 " Confession, because they cannot be without the
 " Sacrament of *Order*, nor Order without a true
 " *Bishop*, neither can he receive Order, who is not
 " baptized. Behold Millions of Nullities of Sa-
 " craments, by the Malice of one Minister, in one
 " Act only!" And, would to God, says he, that
 " these Cases were rare!" If then there be no Con-

* Bp. of *Minori*, History of the Council of *Trent*, p. 241.

secration, there is no Change; and if no Change, they who worship the Host, by their own Acknowledgment, worship nothing but Bread and Wine; and surely this is as rank Idolatry as the Worship of *Garlick and Onions*.

In the same Sacrament they are likewise guilty of *Sacrilege*; in stealing the Cup from the Laity. *Drink ye all of it*, was our Blessed Lord's Command. And what have they to say against it? Let us hear the Council which forbid it to the Laity. "Tho' Christ instituted and administered to his Disciples, this venerable Sacrament under both Kinds of Bread and Wine; and although in the Primitive Church, it was received by the Faithful under both Kinds; yet notwithstanding, for the avoiding some Dangers and Scandals, this Custom is, upon reasonable Grounds, introduced, that it be received by Lay-people under the Kind of Bread only." I fear there is no Institution, which is not exposed to some Dangers and Scandals; but sure they must be grievous ones indeed, that can justify the setting aside any of Christ's Institutions. What they were, learn from the Defender of that Decree in the Council of *Constance*. "1. The Danger of spilling the Wine. 2. The Danger in carrying from Place to Place. 3. In defiling the Vessels (which ought to be kept as sacred Things) by being touched and handled by Lay-men. 4. In the long Beards of the Lay-men. 5. In keeping the consecrated Wine for the Use of the Sick; because Vinegar may be generated in the Vessel, and so the Blood of Christ would cease to be there, and pure Vinegar would be administered for the Blood of Christ; besides in

! Council of *Constance*.

! *Gerfon*, Chancellor of *Paris*.

" Sum-

" Summer-Flies may be generated, and some-
 " times it may putrify and become loathsome ;
 " and some might loath to drink it, because many
 " others had drank of it before. 6. Wine would
 " be chargeable, especially in such Places where
 " it is scarce. There would be, moreover, Dan-
 " ger of freezing in Winter ; and there would be
 " further Danger in giving Occasions many Ways
 " to the People to believe that which is false ; As
 " that Lay-men, as to the receiving of the
 " Sacrament, are of equal Dignity with Priests."

Such are the Dangers and Scandals, which they
 fear more than the Displeasure of Christ ; and for
 the avoiding of which they set at naught his In-
 stitution, and sacrilegiously deprive the People of
 their Participation of his Blood ! Some indeed argue
 sophistically, that " it is impossible to separate the
 " Effect of his Blood from that of his Body " But
 others hold, that " the Sumption under both Kinds,
 " which was that which our Lord delivered, was
 " more compleat and more efficacious " And
 Suarez says, that " grave Men relate that this was
 " held by most of the Fathers, who were present
 " in the Council of Trent." So by their own Con-
 fession they withhold from their People Encrease of
 Grace, lest they should think themselves, as to
 receiving of the Sacrament, *of equal Dignity with*
Priests ! O detested Pride ! in vile Earth, and mi-
 serable Sinners !

But it is not my Meaning to number all their Er-
 rors, only to convince you that our Ancestors had
 Reasons sufficient for *the Reformation*, and that we
 have abundant Cause to bless God for the Enjoy-
 ment of it.

☞ De Meaux.

☞ Alexander Alenſis, & Vaſquez.

Neither are these Errors merely *speculative*, but have notoriously a fatal Influence on *Practice*. I mean not to take into the Vices of which they are guilty contrary to their Principles, but such as flow from them, or are encouraged by them.

From a Persuasion of *Infallibility*, proceeds Obstinacy in Error, and Maintenance of it by Fraud and Force; Breach of Faith with Heretics, Equivocations, and Mental Reservations to delude their Opposers; Rapine and Plunder of their Goods, Seditions, Conspiracies, and Rebellions; bloody Inquisitions and Massacres; insomuch that Bands of Thieves and Robbers are more to be trusted, and more merciful than They.

From their enjoined *Celibacy* hath issued such a Deluge of the most filthy and abominable Lusts, as no chaste Tongue can utter, no chaste Ear can hear without Detestation.

Their Doctrines of *Merit*, and *Supererogation* have produced an arrogant Presumption and Confidence in their own Righteousness; and that too on Account of mere external Performances, such as Almsgiving, Pilgrimages, Abstinence from Meats, and the like; which occasioned our first Reformers to insist so particularly upon Justification by Faith only: though from thence some warm but weak Heads have been misled, and embraced very dangerous Opinions concerning the Christian Obligation to *Good Works*.

Purgatory and *Indulgences* are such Arts for the Promotion and Encouragement of Sin, that it is no Wonder if the *Roman Church* has been particularly fruitful in it. With respect to the latter, the Princes of *Germany* represented to the Pope, "that true

* In the Diet of *Nuremberg*. A. D. 1522.

" Christian

“ Christian Piety was destroyed by them; and
 “ that all manner of Wickedness did spring from
 “ thence; and that Men were afraid of committing
 “ no kind of Sins, when at so cheap a Rate they
 “ could purchase a Remission for them.”

Their Corruptions called aloud for a Reformation; The Pope himself acknowledged it, *Adrian VI.* and promised to begin it. His own good Life, and the Disgust which his Acknowledgment gave to the Court of *Rome* are Inducements to believe he was sincere in his Promise: But his speedy Death prevented the Execution. His Successors were of a different Spirit, and laboured rather to *establish*, than to *correct* the Errors of those in their Communion. Particular Churches then found there was a Necessity to provide for themselves, *to remember from whence they were fallen, and repent, and do the first Works.*

But let us beware of a Pharisaical Comparison, and of nursing a Spiritual Pride with a God, *I thank thee, I am not as other Men are!* Let us leave them to God; and call home our Thoughts, survey the woful Furniture of our own Consciences, and with truly contrite Hearts cry out, *Lord, be merciful to us Sinners!* And though in Number and Degree Their Vices may exceed Ours, yet Ours have an *Aggravation* beyond Theirs; Theirs are the natural Consequences of very bad Principles, Ours in Violation of the Best. The Abhorrence of their Crimes, which occasioned our Forefathers to *protest* against them, should make Us, their Sons, watchful over our Conduct, that we may live worthy such Protestation and Profession. Where we are conscious to ourselves, that we are fallen, *let us remember from whence we are fallen, and repent, and do the first Works:* Lest God in Vengeance of our Abuse of his Mercies in blessing us with the Reformation,

mation, should remove the Light of his Glorious Gospel, plunge us again into the Darkness of Popish Superstition, and scourge us with the Rod of Rome.

Lord, we beseech thee to keep thy Household the Church in continual Godliness, that through thy Protection it may be free from all Adversities, and devoutly given to serve thee in good Works, to the Glory of thy Name, through Jesus Christ our Lord,



SERMON



SERMON II.

JOHN xvi. 2.

(former Part of the Verse,)

They shall put you out of the Synagogues.—

WE have seen in the preceding Discourse, that several of those Points in *Doctrine* and *Worship* which were suspected, and complained of about the Time of the Reformation, were really Errors and Corruptions of the Original Plan. It was not necessary to examine more of them, those before mentioned being sufficient to convince us how greatly a Reformation was to be desired. I proceed to enquire

SECONDLY, whether by reforming manifest Errors, without Leave from the Church of *Rome*, we are guilty of *Schism*, and thereby stand justly exposed to the Sentence of *Excommunication* and *Damnation*.

The Connection certainly is not very obvious betwixt the Reformation of manifest Errors, and the Guilt of *Schism*. Let us see by what Medium the Church of *Rome* would prove them to be the same Thing.

Their

Their Pope claims a Supremacy over the Universal Church of Christ, as Head of it; and on this Foundation assumes Authority over the particular Church of *England*, pretending to separate her from the Communion of Christ's Body; As the corrupted Church of God, under the Government of the Pharisees, treated the first Christian Reformers, and put them out of the Synagogues. From our Denial of such Supremacy they reproach us with *Schism*, and ring in our Ears the Guilt and Danger of it.

Their Claim is publick and notorious, as is evident from the Acknowledgment of their Doctors; "We acknowledge a Head established by God, to conduct his whole Flock in his Paths; which Head is the Pope as Successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and that the Papal Chair is the common Centre of all Christian Unity." Which is agreeable to their Catechism published by the *Trent* Fathers, "The Pope, (say they,) has by divine Right, not by human Constitutions, a supreme Degree of Dignity and Jurisdiction over the Universal Church as Peter's Successor, sitting in his Chair, and as Vicar of Christ." Consonant to the Constitution of *Boniface VIII.* "There is but one Catholic Church, out of which there is no Salvation: Our Blessed Saviour made Peter, and his Successors his Vice-gerents, and Heads of that Church; and to be subject to the Pope of Rome is absolutely necessary to Salvation." This was ratified by the *Lateran* Council confirmed by *Leo X*; and is required by Oath to be received, believed, and

^a De Menx. ^b Part. 2. de Ordinib. Sacramento. §. 51.

^c Dat. Romæ A. D. 1301.

professed by all Bishops, Canons, Dignitaries, all Regulars of whatever Order, all who have Cure of Souls, all who profess and teach any of the liberal Arts, Laicks as well as Clergys. All these therefore are sworn to believe us Schismaticks, and in a State of Damnation.

In vain do we plead in our Excuse, that the Errors which we reformed were such, as we could not continue to profess without violating our Consciences: they tell us in Answer, "If the Pope should err in commanding Vices, and forbidding Virtues, the Church would be bound to believe Vices to be good, and Virtues to be bad."

So that it is a lost Case with us, if the Church of Rome may sit as Judge. We therefore appeal from her arbitrary Decisions to the Great Judge and common Master of Her and Us. The Church of England plays not with the Guilt of Schism, nor slights the Punishment of it. She acknowledges the *Holy Catholick Church*, which is Christ's *one Body*, animated by *one Spirit*, on whose gracious Assistance and Assurances is built the *one Hope of our Calling*, subject to *one Lord*, in the Unity of *one Faith*, by the Admission of *one Baptism*, to the Glory of *one God and Father of all*. *EPHES. iv. 4, 5, 6.*

To separate and cut ourselves off from the Communion of this *Holy Catholick Church*, would be indeed a most deadly *Schism*; and to be deservedly thrown out of it a *Punishment* that I would deprecate with Prayers and Tears, and earnestly endeavour to be restored again. As we are charged with this Sin by the Church of Rome, it becomes us to consider, whether we are guilty or not: If we are, that we may return to its Bosom again; if we are

* Bellarm. de Pontif. Roman. lib. 4. cap. 5.

not, that we may justify our Separation to our own Consciences, and against their Attacks; that we may stand fast in the Liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the Yoke of Bondage, GAL. V. 1.

They lay their Foundation by defining Schism to be a Division from the true Church*, which may be committed by a Division from a particular Church. But, 1. This Division is stated too generally; for Persons may be separated from a true Church, and yet be no Schismatics. The Jewish Church, though corrupted, was, I presume, a true One; otherwise our Saviour would not have communicated with it: But when They put the Christians out of their Synagogues, and cut them off from their Communion, such Separation did not make the Christians Schismatics. In like manner, when the Church of Rome thrust us from them, and cut us off from their Fellowship by horrid Anathema's, such Excommunication of theirs, though it separated and divided us from them, was certainly no Schism in us: It was They who made the Rent, not We. We must therefore mend the Definition, and say, that Schism is a voluntary Division from a true Church. Wherefore so far as our Separation is upon Compulsion, so far they must acquit us. But they will refer us to the Cause of this Excommunication, which was, that we refused their Terms of Communion before they cut us off, and in so doing made a voluntary Division from them. Wherefore it must be farther observed, that

Neither is every voluntary Division from a true Church Schism. When Paul was at Ephesus, he went into the Synagogue, and spake boldly for the Space

* Mercy and Truth, cap. v. §. 2. † Ibid. §. 5.

of three Months, disputing and persuading the Things concerning the Kingdom of God. But when drivers were hardened, and believed not, but spoke Evil of that Way before the Multitude, he departed from them, and separated the Disciples, ACTS xix. 8, 9. So when the Roman Corruptions in Doctrine and Worship were warmly disputed against, and a Reformation of those Corruptions earnestly recommended and entreated, they, like the Ephesians, hardened themselves, and instead of reforming, established their Errors, and spoke Evil of those well-meant Representations and Admonitions. It then became our Duty, like the Disciples, to separate from them, that we might have Opportunity to reform ourselves. Otherwise we must have been Partakers with them in their Idolatries and Impieties; for they would not receive us to external Communion with them, but upon such wicked Terms: nay we must, moreover, have involved ourselves in the Guilt of Hypocrisy and Perjury, professing, and swearing to believe as true, what we knew to be false. When the Communion of a Church imposes such Terms, it is certainly our Duty to refuse those Terms: and if the Consequence of a Refusal in that case be a Separation necessarily, such Separation cannot be a Sin, because it is commanded, R.E.V. xviii. 4. *Come out of her my People, that ye be not Partakers of her Sins.* A Text, which will absolve us, in general, by the unchangeable Truth of its Principle, and justify our Separation from Rome, in particular, if the concurrent Opinion of some of the Fathers, several of the Papists, and many of the Protestants may be relied on, agreeing that Rome is meant in that Passage*. We must therefore once more correct the

* Testimonia ex variis authoribus collecta, Romam Babyloniam

the Definition, and make it a *consequence*, as well as a *voluntary* Division from a true Church. In the Definition they indeed say, *The true Church*: but in their Arguments always mean their own *particular*, which has been charitably hoped, notwithstanding its Error, to be a true Church. From such a one every Division is not Schism. But

II. *The true Church* means the *Catholick or Universal Church of Christ*, not the *Roman Catholick*, or Part of it. *The true Catholick Universal Church* must be *One*, containing *all* the Parts of it: which not any particular Church on Earth can do, nor all the Christian Churches dispersed over the Face of the whole Earth, together, can do. For it comprehends *the general Assembly*, from the First-born in it, the Apostles, and all who from that Time to the End of the World have *their Names written in Heaven*, *Heb. xii. 23*. To which Church all the true Believers on Earth are united, and make a *Part* of it only. The Union of this Catholick Church is, that they have been incorporated into this *one Body* by the Sacrament of *one Baptism*; having the same Symbol of Communion, *one Faith*, united to the same Head, *one Lord Jesus Christ*. From this true Church, as we can have no Cause, so neither will we voluntarily separate; And, which is happy for us, the Curse of *Rome* cannot cut us off, or excommunicate us from it.

In a restrained Sense, however, *the true Church* may mean the Catholick Church *militant here on Earth*; not in this, or that particular Place, in *Antioch or Alexandria, in Rome, or England*, but all the Faithful, wherever dispersed over the whole

lona esse, ejusque Episcopum jure Antichristum dici. Per Simon. Schardium, in calce Epistolarum Petri de vincis. Basil. 566.
World.

World. The Bonds of essential Union with this Church, can be no other than those beforementioned, which make the Union of the whole. They must have *one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism*. These essential Points you will find mentioned in almost all St. Paul's Epistles in brief, or at large; as, *To the Saints, and faithful Brethren in Christ*, COL. 1. 2. *To the Saints*, those set apart, and consecrated by Baptism; and *faithful Brethren*, professing the same Faith; *in Christ*, under one Lord Jesus. So again, *To the Saints which are at Ephesus, and to the Faithful, in Christ Jesus*, EPHES. i. 1. These only belong to the Essence of the true Catholick Church.

I. We have been engrafted, and incorporated into this Church by *Baptism*; according to the Rite prescribed by Christ himself, by the outward Element of Water, and Consecration to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; the Form, in which the Faithful now in Heaven were admitted. Upon this Foundation, laid by Christ, our Adversaries have built *Ward, and Hay, and Stubble*: We have restored this Sacrament to it's primitive Simplicity, and Purity, and leave their Superstructure of Spittle, and Salt, and Candles, and I know not what Rubbish, to abide the Fire as it may. Yet, as they retain the Foundation, we do not deny them to be a true Church. To which *Charity* of ours they are more beholden, than they are to the *Doctrines* of their own; for according to that, which holds the Intention of the Priest to be necessary in Baptism, they not only add an unwarrantable Condition, but make it impossible for any one in their Communion to know whether he is a Member of the Catholick Church, or not. So that in *this Point*

^a Vid. Serm. I. pag. 21.

our Church was before *Luther*, where it has been since: only we have stript it of some combustible Matter, which might endanger the Foundation.

2. We profess the same *Faith*, or *Form of sound Words*, which the First-born, who are written in Heaven, professed before us: Whether, as summarily included in the Institution of Baptism, or more explicitly drawn forth in the Apostles Creed, which we, and every Christian Church in the World do profess when admitted into the Flock of Christ. The *Nicene* and *Atanasian* add no new Articles, only (as Heresies arose) explain the Sense of the Apostles Creed: These we likewise receive with the rest of the Christian Churches. Nay *Rome* itself at Baptism requires no other than the *Apostles Creed* to be professed; and at the Council of *Trent*, they made their Confession by a Repetition of the *Nicene*, which they established as the formal Faith of the Church of *Rome*; that Faith which is the Principle of *Christian Unity*¹. In this *Point* therefore we are not separated from the true Church, our Adversaries themselves being Judges. Indeed 18 Years afterwards they drew up another Creed, stuffed up with many other Articles unsupported by Scripture, nay contrary to it, which the Saints in Heaven never professed, and never heard of; and yet they damn all, who refuse to subscribe to them. The avoiding such vain and profane Babling can be no Schism. Those, who profess them, we leave to answer for themselves: not *un-churcing* them for this Reason; because, *with* these unjustifiable Additions, they also hold the true Faith. Here again we know where our Church was before *Luther*, namely, wherever the

¹ Sess. iii. A. D. 1546.

true Faith was professed over the whole Earth: But if they will make the *Roman Creed* the Character of their Church, they will be more puzzled to answer, where was *their* Church before *Luther*? Because that Creed was not framed till 18 Years after *Luther* was dead.

3. We hold the same Lord and Head, *Jesus Christ*, of whom the whole Family as well in Heaven as in Earth are named, *EPHES. v. 15.* Him, and no other, God gave to be Head over all Things to the Church, which is his Body, *EPHES. i. 22.* from whom the whole Body is fitly joined together, chap. iv. 16. He only can be Head of the true Church, whose Years shall not fail; and to which all the Members of it can be joined, and subject. Now, it will be difficult to persuade one's self, that the Saints in Heaven are subject to the Pope of *Rome*. And if the Saints in Heaven have one Lord, and the Faithful on Earth another, then the Catholick Church is no longer *One*, but *Two*, under separate Heads. They therefore who set up another Head beside Christ, divide the Church, and make the Schism. However our Adversaries do, in Words, confess Christ, when they call their Pope the *Vicar* of Christ: And we accept their Confession so far, as to hope it is sincere enough to keep them Members of the Church, how inconsistent soever their general Tenets may be with the Acknowledgment of one Lord only, *Jesus Christ*. But their joining Angels with him in religious Worship, (how much more the joining of Images and Reliques?) will, if we believe *St. Paul*, draw upon them a Suspicion at least of *not bolding the Head*, *COL. ii. 19.* And when they say, that though our Blessed Saviour was chiefly that fundamental Rock on which the Church is founded, yet *Peter* and the Popes of *Rome* succeeded him as his Vi-

cars, with *supreme Power*^k; that *Peter*, and every Successor of his, was constituted *supreme Head*, Prince, and Monarch of the *Universal Church*^l; and at the same time argue, as they did against Queen *Elizabeth's* Supremacy, that *supreme* is above all, not Christ nor his Church excepted—they certainly seem to mean to depose Christ from being *supreme Head*, and to clap the Pope in his Stead. Nay their *Trent Catechism* declares, that Christ left him plainly the *same Power*^m over the whole Church, as He himself had. Is not this removing Christ, and investing the Bishop of *Rome* with his Authority? And, in just Consequence of this blasphemous Opinion, the Gloss on their Canon Law tells us, that the Pope is *something more than Man*ⁿ. Another calls him, *on Earth the supreme Deity*^o. And another Gloss, *Our Lord GOD the Pope*^p. And whatever he shall determine and decree, is to be received *as if God himself had decreed it*^q.

Now because we refuse to acknowledge this impiously usurped Supremacy of their Pope, (which by God's Grace we will continue to do so long as we live;) confessing that *Jesus Christ is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father*, PHIL. ii. 11. for this Reason are we treated as Schismatics, and excommunicated; for this Reason *Diotrephes, who loveth to have the Preeminence among them, receiveth us*

^k Summâ potestate. *Menochius* in Matth. ^l *Tirinus* in Matth. ^m Part 1. Artic. 9. §. 15. ⁿ Nec Deus es, nec Homo, quasi neuter es, inter utrumque. Glossa ad Proem. Clement. verbo *Papa*. ^o Supremum in Terris Numen. *Stapleton*. ^p Dominum Deum nostrum Papam. Glossa ad cap. cum inter 4. verbo declaramus. ^q Quod ille (Petri Successor) à Cathedrâ decreverit, habendum est tanquam ab ipso Deo decretum. *Tirinus* in Matth.

not, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth us out of the Church. *JOH. iii. 9, 10.* But I trust we are no more cut off from the true Church by *their* Censures, than *St. John* was by those of *Diotrephes*. Yet we excommunicate not the Bishop of *Rome*, or his Flock; we admit *them* to be a Part, though but a Part, and an extremely corrupted Part of the Catholick Church; and *Him* to be, by Virtue of Christ's Commission, Bishop of the particular Church of *Rome*; and, by Virtue of human Grants and Indulgences, to have a Precedency before all other Bishops in the World; and a Supremacy of Jurisdiction in such Territories, as the same human Powers which first conferred them, are still willing to allow him.

Whoever breaks the Unity in any one of those abovementioned Particulars, "is not baptized," "rejects the Faith," "casts off Christ from being his Head," He is no longer a Christian, but rends, or keeps himself divided from the true Catholick *Invisible* Church, and should, if he has been admitted into it, by Excommunication be cut off from the *Visible*. But it is manifest, that in none of these Bonds of essential Union are we divided from the true Church; and consequently so far we are no Schismatics.

III. However we are farther told, and we acknowledge it to be true, "that Schism may be committed by dividing from a particular Church." To judge of the Nature, and proportionable Guilt and Danger of this Sin, it may be observed, that as there is an Union which is *essential*, the Breach of which is a Division from the Church, and the Effect is spiritual *Death* in the divided Member;

which is the Schism that has been already considered: So there is also an Union which is a *Duty*, the Breach of which is a Division in the Church, and the Effect is spiritual *Disease* in the *dividing* Member; and this is the Schism what is most generally meant. The Persons guilty of it, like other disobedient Sinners, may be Christians, tho' wicked ones: They do in several Degrees and Measures, impossible to be ascertained, deprive themselves of the Communications of Grace, so as sometimes to cease to be living Members of Christ's invisible Church, and yet, through an Excess of Charity or Falseness of Judgment, may be suffered to continue undivided, though withered, Branches of the visible Church: Others again, through a Want of Charity or Falseness of Judgment, may be deemed dead Branches, and so cut off from external Communion, and yet receive Communications of Life and Grace, by an inward Communion with the Invisible Church.

The first kind of Union regarded the *Substance*, this the *Influences* of Christianity; it is not sufficient that the Branch be in the Vine, unless reciprocal Communications quicken it and give it Vigor to produce Fruit. For this End Christ has appointed a Ministry, that by them *the Body as by Joints and Bands having Nourishment ministered, and knit together, make Increase with the Increase of God.* Col. ii. 19. And the Usefulness of these Communications shews the Importance of connecting the Parts by such Joints and Bands, and the Danger of a Disunion. As will be more clearly seen in the following Instances:

1. One End for which the Ministry was instituted was to convey Nourishment and Increase from the Head to the Members, by dispensing God's *Word* and *Sacraments*: To answer this End, we retain the

Scriptures

Scriptures without Addition or Diminution; we read them in our Churches, as they were wrote and intended to be read, in the Language understood by them to whom they are addressed; we interpret them agreeably to the primitive Fathers, and the four earliest general Councils: endeavouring at such *Fellowship of the Spirit*, as may make us of one Accord, of one Mind. PHIL. ii. 1, 2. Difference of Opinion must follow from the Difference of Capacity, Diligence, and Disposition of the Disciple; but while such Difference of Opinion is maintained with Meekness, and in Points not contrary to the Decisions of our regular Superiors, it is no blameable Division, breaks not the Unity which is enjoined, nor intercepts the Communications of Wisdom *sufficient to make us wise to Salvation*. But saving Knowledge cannot be so freely conveyed, where the People rend themselves from their Instructors, reject the written Word, or despise it as Letter-learning, and seek out new Channels of their own Invention, and rely upon the Guidance of an inward Light: Or, where the Instructors check the Conveyance to the People by forbidding the Scriptures to be read by them in private, and dealing them out in publick in a strange Language, and interpreting them contrary to the ancient and primitive Doctrines. As in the former Case, by imbibing the most indigested and dissimilar Opinions they deform the Simplicity and Beauty of any particular Church in which they happen; so the Union which results from the Management of the latter, which our Adversaries are so weak to boast of, is equally disgraceful and prejudicial: it is like the Agreement of the common People in vulgar Errors; they have heard so, and believe so, because they know nothing of the Matter. Christian Truths are no more conveyed to the One, than natural Truths to the Other:

Such Management may create Unity of Error, but will never produce Unity of sound Doctrine. They become weak, sickly, and impoverished Branches for want of due Nourishment.

With regard to the Sacrament of Spiritual Growth, we administer it, as Christ instituted it, by the Confession of our Accusers. *We are one Bread and one Body, as we are all Partakers of that one Bread.* 1 COR. x. 17. *And are hereby made to drink all into one Spirit.* 1 COR. xii. 13. This Union is greatly weakened by the People, when they separate themselves from the Communion of the Body of Christ through Neglect, or under Pretence that they want that Holiness, which it was instituted to be a Means of promoting: And likewise by the Spiritual Governors when they defraud the Laity of one half of this Sacrament, contrary to our Saviour's express Command, contrary to the Practice of the primitive Christians, and contrary to the Practice of all other Churches in Christendom.

2. Another End for which the Ministry was instituted, was to convey from the Members to the Head their Returns in the Offerings of Prayer and Praise. This Union in Religious Worship is often mentioned; *They continued with one Accord in Prayer and Supplication.* ACT. i. 14. *They continued daily with one Accord in the Temple,—praising God,* ACT. ii. 46, 47. *With one Mind, and one Mouth glorifying God,* ROM. xv. 6. We therefore have publick Prayer and Thanksgiving, in a prescribed Form, and in a known Tongue, that the whole English Church, however divided in place, may yet join with one Mind and one Mouth in the same reasonable Service. And this Form compiled from the Primitive Liturgies, that we might, as near as possible, agree with all Christian Churches: And so inoffensively framed, that though some of its Compilers testified their

Abhor-

Abhorrence of Popish Superstitions by their Deaths, yet the Papists themselves did a long Time confess its Excellence by joining in it, till, being forbidden by the Bishop of *Rome*, they withdrew their Obedience from their *English* Governors to whom it was due, and paid it to a Stranger to whom it was not due. And besides this Schism, of which the *English Papists* are guilty in dividing from a particular Church of which they ought to be Members; even in the Service of *Rome* the Union of Mind, which is required in Religious Worship, is broken by its being performed in an unknown Tongue; for it is impossible for them to join *with one Mind* in those Prayers and Praises which they understand nothing of. Besides of this *Half-worship*, at the best, the Worship of the Spirit without the Understanding, how great a Part is diverted from God and Christ, by their Invocation of Saints and Angels, and their idolatrous Worship of Images and Reliques?

3. These Means and Instruments of Conveyance make another Bond of Unity in the Church, which is the Unity of *Government and Discipline*. Christ is Head of the Church, which he governed with supreme Authority in Person while on Earth: And when his Departure prevented him from the future *visible* Exercise of it, he appointed his Apostles to succeed to it, with Right to delegate it; They consecrated Bishops and Priests, with Deacons to assist, as the Encrease and Occasions of the Church required. Such Government has always obtained in the Church; I mean a Presbytery in a limited District, with a President over them, assisted by an inferior Order of Ministers: where these Powers are warrantably derived, it matters not by what Name they are called, *Apostles, Bishops, Overseers, Superintendants, Patriarchs or Popes; Teachers, Pastors, Priests*

Priests or Elders. But a Schism is made when we divide from our own particular Church by a *seditions* Refusal to submit to our lawfully instituted Governors; or by a *tyrannous* Usurpation of Authority never committed to Us. *We* are charged by the Bishop of *Rome*, as guilty in the first Case; while we recriminate, and say the Schism, if any be, is *Theirs* in the *second* Case. We defend ourselves, in that we have a regular Ordination and Succession of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, to whose spiritual Administration in Things sacred we submit ourselves: They say, that all these spiritual Ministers, together with the People, ought to be subject to the Bishop of *Rome*; who, they say, was left by Christ as the Universal Bishop, and Governor of *all Christendom*. A great Claim! Let us hear how they would maintain it.

1. They urge Christ's Appointment: — If they prove that, I will submit, in Spite of a *Præmunire*. They attempt to prove it thus; Christ invested *Peter* with this Supremacy and Monarchy; *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*; his Successors in that See succeed to his full Power. Every Part destitute of Proof! Have they, as Successors of St. *Peter* his full Powers? *Peter* had the infused Habit of speaking with Tongues, and of working Miracles; let them produce these Seals of their Commission, and we obey.

Or will they confine the Grant to supreme Jurisdiction? Then it is to be observed, that if Succession to *Peter* gives this Jurisdiction, we must invest the Bishop of *Antioch* with it, because *Peter* was Bishop there seven Years, as say our Adversaries.

Perhaps they will tell us, that St. *Peter* transferred this supreme Jurisdiction from *Antioch* to *Rome*, and left it as the Privilege of his Successor in that See. But that he transferred any Jurisdiction

tion from *Antioch* to *Rome* is not proved: Nay that he was Bishop of *Rome*, or ever there, is greatly questioned: and what is worse than all, *Peter* himself never had any such supreme Jurisdiction over the whole Church, as they pretend to.

They ground this Claim on the following Passages: *Thou art Peter, and on this Rock I will build my Church*: MATH. xvi. 18. To understand the precise Meaning of *this Rock*, we must have recourse to the Language in which our Saviour spoke, in which *Peter's* Name was *Cephas*, *thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by Interpretation a Stone*, JON. i. 42. from *Cepha* in the *Syriack* or *Chaldaick* Tongue signifying a Rock or Stone: Not any Rock or Stone, but properly a *crooked*¹ or angular one, fit for a Corner-stone to connect and strengthen the Building. The Metaphor therefore is not as a Rock for a Foundation to support the *whole* Building, but as a Corner-stone to connect with, and in *part* support the rest of the Building. This principal Word being explained, we are the better prepared to find out the Meaning of the Passage in *St. Matthew*; and if of two probable Interpretations we cannot *certainly* determine which is the true one, yet we shall be able to see what *may be*, and what *cannot be*, the meaning of it.

Our Saviour asks all his Apostles, whom Men thought him to be? They inform him of the various Reports which prevailed about him. He then asks them their own Opinion. Whether they he-

¹ Whence among the *Chaldei* their *Littera ligabiles*, or Letters which would join or connect with others were called *קשיות*; And *קשת* was an Arch, Vault, Roof, or Pent-house; and hence from its crooked Form the Letter *Q* or *קש*.

sitated, or *Simon's* ever prompt Spirit got the Start, He first replies, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God*; explaining by the latter Words what he thought of the *Messias*. Our Saviour tells him that this true and ready Confession shall derive Honour to him, in Memory of which he shall have a new Name given him, alluding to the Character of that Confession which is *the Corner-stone* in the *Oeconomy* of Christian Faith. But as it was not yet Time to publish the Truth to the World, he enjoins his Disciples Silence on this Point for the present, *charging them to tell no Man that He was Jesus THE CHRIST, or MESSIAS, Vers. 20.* And This, one of their principal Champions, the Professor of *Doway*¹, acknowledges to have been the Interpretation of many of the Fathers, and of four several Popes², to which others might have been added³. Nay their *Trent Council* decreed, that the Confession of Faith was the firm and *only* Foundation⁴. Though the *Trent Catechism* published by the same Authority explains it of the Person of *Peter*⁵. This *Inconsistency* we leave their *infallible* Church to digest as it can; and what cannot its Stomach gorge! But the Authority of half a dozen Popes, and the *Council of Trent*, we think sufficient Arguments against a Popish Adversary to prove that the *Person of Peter* is not meant by *this Rock*, and conse-

¹ Stapleton. ² Per *Petram*, Confessionem Fidei intelligunt *Chrysostomus, Cyrillus, Hilarius, & Rom. Pontifices, Leo Magnus, Agatho, Nicolaus, & Adrianus primus* in suis Decretalibus. *Princip. Fidei Doct. Demonstr. Controvers.* 2. l. 6. c. 2. p. 207, 208.

³ *Felix III. & Joh. VIII.* Vid. *Serm. I. p. 5.* ⁴ Synodus statuit, præmittendam esse Confessionem Fidei—*Symbolum Fidei*;—Fundamentum firmum ac *Unicum*, contra quod portæ Inferi nunquam prævalebunt. *Seff. 3. Feb. 4. Ann. 1546.*

⁵ *Catechism ad Parochos pars 1. Artic. Symb. 9. §. 15. super Unum ædificat Ecclesiam.*

quently

quently no Universal Supremacy conferred on him by our Saviour's Declaration in this Passage.

If it be interpreted of the *Person* of *Peter*, the Meaning must be this; This early Confession of thine shall procure thee this Honour, to be laid a *Corner-stone* first after me in the building of my Church, in which with several co-ordinate ones, you shall support *Your* Part, and They *Theirs*; but in Honour of being first laid after me, you shall be called by a Name signifying that Firmness and Aptness required in such Corner-stones.

This may be the Meaning, because it is consonant with other Scriptures: But that *Peter* is the Rock on which the *Whole Church* is built, or the *Chief Corner-stone* which gives Direction and Rule to the whole Plan, and Superstructure cannot be meant; because it is expressly contradicted by several Scriptures. St. *Peter* himself, to whom the Declaration was made, assures us that Christ was the *chief Corner-stone*, and the Head of the Corner, 1 PET. ii. 6, 7. And in the Visions of St. *John*, the Wall of the City of God had twelve Foundations, and in them the Names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb, REV. xxi. 14. Where St. *Peter's* Stone, place it where you will in the Square, was but co-ordinate with the rest of the Apostles. And St. *Paul* tells us, We are built upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone. In whom all the Building fitly framed together, groweth unto an Holy Temple in the Lord, EPHES. ii. 20, 21. Whence it appears that all the Apostles had an equal Power in God's House, and that none but Christ had a Supremacy over the rest.

Another Text, which they urge, immediately follows; And I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt

shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven, MATT. xvi. 19. Upon which, says Bellarmine, "unto whom the Keys of a City are delivered, he is appointed the King, at least the Governor of it, to admit and shut out whom he pleases. The Keys define his Power; *Loosing and Binding* the Office belonging to it." But themselves acknowledge, that the Ancients by an unanimous Consent say, that these Keys were given to the whole Church in the Person of *Peter*. Therefore the unanimous Consent of Antiquity is confessed by them to be against *St. Peter's* Supremacy as founded upon this Text. And besides, that Scripture informs us the other Apostles received the same Power and Commission, *JOHN. XX. 22, 23.* the Council of *Trent* defines that the Power of the Keys was given to all Priests; and proves it from this very Passage, upon which they pretend to build *St. Peter's* peculiar Privilege and Supremacy.

Their last Text is in *Christ's* Words to *Simon*, *Feed my Sheep.* *JOHN. XIX. 16.* That it was *Peter's* Duty to feed the Sheep or Flock of *Christ* we very readily grant; but we are well assured that he was not the only Pastor whose Duty it was to do so. *St. Paul* enjoins the Elders of *Ephesus*, *Take heed to all the Flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers, to feed the Church of God, ACT. XX. 28.* And *St. Peter* himself acknowledges that he was but equal with others in this Duty; *The Elders which are among you, I exhort, who am also an Elder, or Fellow-Elder, — Feed the Flock of God, 1 PET. V. 1, 2.* And both the Catechism^a and Council^b

^a *Du Pio de antiqua Ecclesia Diss. iv. c. 1. sect. 1.*
^b *Sess. 14. de Pœnitentiâ. cap. 5.* ^c *De Pœnitentiâ. cap. 6.*
^d *Part. 2. De Ordin. Sacram.*
^e *Concil. Trident. Sess. 21. de Reformat. cap. 1.*

of *Yron* make it the Duty of all Bishops, and every one who hath Cure of Souls, by Divine Command to rule and feed the Sheep of Christ. Consequently these Words contain a *Duty common* to all the Apostles, and their Successors, not a *Grant peculiar* to *Peter*, and the Pope. Wherefore from all the Scriptures which they produce, we infer, in the Words of one of their Cardinals. "We know that *St. Peter* did not receive *more* Power from Christ than the other Apostles; for nothing was said to *Peter*, which was not also said to the others." Therefore adds he, "We rightly say, that *All* the Apostles were *equal* to *Peter* in Power." However if they cannot make good the Pope's Claim to Supremacy from the authentic Records of *Scripture*, they plead *Prescription*.

II. Now as to the *Precedence* given to the See of *Rome* by ancient Christian Writers, and Councils, We likewise grant it, because *They* gave it, i. e. a *Precedence among Equals*. The Reason they assign is, because *Rome* was the *Royal City*. In the Beginning they did generally follow the Division of the *State*, in settling the Government of the *Church*: Every particular City had its Magistrate and Council; and there the Church placed a Bishop and Presbytery, or Chapter. As the City had an adjacent Territory within its Jurisdiction, governed by subordinate Magistrates in every Town and Village, all subject to the chief City Magistrate; so the Church had likewise its Choroepiscopi, Pastors, Teachers or Priests in every Village and Town, subject to the Bishop of the City and adjacent Territory. Farther, as all the Cities of a Province were under the Authority of a superior

* *Cassius*, † Council of *Chalcidon*,

Magistrate,

Magistrate, a Prætor, or Proconsul, who resided in the Metropolis; so all the Bishops of a Province were under an Archbishop, or *Metropolitan*. Lastly, about *Constantine's* Time, several Provinces were united into one Diocese^s, under an Exarch or Vicar of the *Roman* Empire: So far the Church also proceeded; for its more harmonious and secure Government, and threw several *Metropolitans* under a *Patriarch*. By these Means and Degrees the Bishop of *Rome* grew to have Jurisdiction over the Archbishops and Bishops within his Patriarchate, or those ten *Roman* Provinces which, in the Civil Government, were subject to the *Vicarius Urbis*; and by Reason of the Dignity of his City¹ he obtained *Precedence* before, (but not Jurisdiction over,) all other Patriarchs. For their Privileges and Authority are reserved to them by the same Council of *Nice*, which preserves and determines² those of the See of *Rome*. For the same Reason, when *Constantinople* was made the Residence of the Emperor, and grew to be the Royal City, the Bishop of it rose from a Suffragan to the Primate of *Heraclea* into a Patriarch, and took Place of all the Patriarchs, next to Him of *Rome*, by the Decrees of Two Councils¹. The Words of the latter run thus, "Our Forefathers gave *Old Rome* her Privileges in regard that she was the Royal City: "And those 150 Bishops (in the Council of *Constantinople*) were moved with the same Consideration

According to the modern Use of the Word, *Diocesi* means a Bishop's Jurisdiction, less than a Province; but anciently it signified a Patriarch's Jurisdiction, and larger than a Province.

Antiquæ Romæ Throno quia Urbs illa imperarat, jure
Patres dederunt Privilegia. Concil. Chalced. Can. 28.

^k Council of Nice. Canon. 6. Suburbicariarum Ecclesiarum sollicitudinem gerere. ^l Constantinople, & Chalcedon.

tion

tion to grant equal Privileges to the Episcopal Throne of *New Rome*; judging it but reasonable, that the City which was honoured with the Royal Seat of the Empire and Senate, and enjoyed the same Privileges with *Old Rome* in all Matters of a Civil Nature, should also be advanced to the same Dignity in Ecclesiastical Affairs, and be counted the Second in Order after her." The Title of *Universal Bishop* was never heard of till near 600 Years after Christ; and then was first claimed by the Bishop of *Constantinople*: His good Neighbour of *Rome* was offended at this arrogant Claim, and declared it was an Antichristian Title. However, soon after, his Successors assumed it; and they now challenge as *Christian* and *Original*, a Title, undeniably *New*, and in the Opinion of their elder Popes *Antichristian*. But they still say the *British* Churches at least are subject to the Pope's Jurisdiction,

III. As being in Provinces within his Patriarchate. The Falseness of this Claim appears from this, that in the Division of the State the *British Isles* were a distinct Diocese, (in the ancient Use of the Word) from the Diocese of *Italy*, much less was it contained within the *Roman Praefecture*, which was but a Part of the *Italick* Diocese, and the Extent of the Patriarchate of the Pope. Accordingly a

= How hard this Canon bears against the Pope's Supremacy in the Opinion of the Church of *Rome*, and what scandalous Arts they make use of to deceive, appears, 1. from some of their Writers *leaving out* that Canon: and 2. from others corrupting it by a false Translation, and rendering *ἴσα* by *similia*, *ὑπερῶς ἢ τὴν πόλιν* by *superior Rome*, and *ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς*, by *Non tamen in Ecclesiasticis*.

learned and ingenuous Writer * of their own, exempts *Germany, Spain, France, Britain, Africa, Illyricum*, and seven of the *Italick* Provinces from any Subjection to the *Roman* Patriarch. Which is confirmed by Ecclesiastical History, in which we find the *Italick* Provinces contending with the Bishop of *Rome* on this very Point, and denying his Superiority (except that of Precedence) over them: the Decrees of *African* Councils, (over which Tract of Christendom the *Romans* would extend their *Western Patriarchate*,) prohibiting all Appeals to *Rome*, and disowning its Jurisdiction: As did the *French* Synods also for 800 Years: And our *British* Bishops and Clergy A. D. 601. protested against the Pope's Supremacy, when *Augustine* the Monk required them to submit to it, as appears by the Reply of *Dinoth* the Abbot of *Bangor*. "The *British* Churches, says he, owe the
 " Deference of Brotherly Kindness and Charity
 " to the Church of God, and to the Pope of
 " *Rome*, and to all Christians. But other Obedi-
 " ence than this, they did not know to be due
 " to him, whom they called Pope. And for
 " their Parts, they were under the Jurisdiction
 " of the Bishop of *Caerleon* upon *Ush*, who, under
 " God, was their spiritual Overseer, and Direc-
 " tor." It is true, that by a bloody Massacre of near 1200 of those Clergy at that Time, and afterwards by various Arts and Oppressions, the Popes swallowed up the *British* Churches in their tyrannous Usurpations; which we had a much bet-

* Du Pin de Disciplin. Eccles. Dissert.

† Spelman. Concil. Vol. 1. p. 108, 109.

ter Right to fling off, and to assert our Christian Liberty, than They had at first to impose, or when imposed to continue: According to a Decree of the *Ephesine* Council, " That no Bishop shall exercise any Jurisdiction in a foreign Province, which has not been under the Government of his Predecessors from the first planting of Christianity. And if any Prelate shall make any forcible Seizure, he shall be obliged to desist from the Invasion, that the Constitutions of the Church may not be violated, nor any Ecclesiastical Pre- tence be made a Cover for worldly Ambition; that the Liberties of Christendom may not be swallowed up by Degrees, which our Lord Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of all Mankind, has purchased for us at the Price of his own Blood."

From these several Considerations we may most safely conclude, that our Rejection of the gross Errors, and Usurpations of the Church of *Rome*, in Obedience to the Decrees of our own proper spiritual Governors, cannot involve us in the Guilt of Schism.

And that this Unity of *Worship*, *Doctrine*, and *Discipline*, may produce the good Fruits designed thereby, Unity of *Love* and Charity for one another, and for all who have the same *one Lord*, *one Faith*, *one Baptism*, where-ever dispersed over the Face of the whole Earth; and Unity of *Obedience* to all Christ's Commands in an uniform, determined Course of Virtue; that we may vindicate our Reformation of Doctrine by a Reformation of Manners, and not abuse the Liberty we have asserted to Licentiousness, let us join in our Addresses to the Throne of Grace, and pray,

O Almighty God, who hast built thy Church upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone: Grant us so to be joined together in Unity of Spirit by their Doctrine, that we may be made an Holy Temple, acceptable unto Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord: To whom, &c.



SERMON



S E R M O N III.

JOHN xvi. 2.
(latter Part of the Verse.)

— *Yea the Time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doth God Service.*

OUR Reformation has been justified by the Duty, which lay upon us to *remember from whence we had sinned, and repent, and do the first Works*^a. And the Charge of Schism brought against us by those, who, because we would not be *Partakers with them in their Sins*, have put us out of *their Synagogues*, has been amply refuted^b. What then have we more to do with the Bishop of Rome?

Why the *Charity* of his Holiness will not let us rest; if he cannot damn, he will at least endeavour by all other Means to cut us off: to pluck up, destroy, scatter and consume^c is the Commission he

^a SERM. I. ^b SERM. II. ^c Damnatio & Excommunicatio Elizabethæ. — *Qui evellat, destruat, dissipet, disperdat.*

pretends to have received from the SAVIOUR of the World; which he executes with an Excess of Compassion^d: To save our Souls, he consigns them to Hell; and to recover us from damnable Heresy, as they call it, decrees our Possessions to Assassins, and our Bodies to the Flames. An extraordinary Charity! of a Piece with their extraordinary Religion, *absurd, and impious!* Founded on a Claim to Supremacy in Temporals over Christian Princes, and their Subjects: In which he zealously pretends to do Honour to his Creator, by stabbing at his Image; and piously challenges a Divine Right to erase God's Creation. This Claim I proceed now in the

THIRD and last Place to examine.

I. It is necessary in the first Place to set down their Claim in their own Words. "There can be
 " no Doubt, says *Baronius*, but that the Civil
 " Principality is subject to the Sacerdotal; and
 " that God hath made the Political Government
 " subject to the Dominion of the Spiritual Church^e."

^d *Damnatio & Excomm. Henrici 8vi. — Cum Excessus Misericordiae fines praevertunt, ut saltem metu poenae ad cor reverti cogentur—Eos Anathematis, Maledictionis, & Damnationis aeternae mucrone percusimus.—Contra eos Armis insurgant, eosque & eorum singulos persequantur, ac ad Unitatem Ecclesiae cogent—Eorumque Bona capiant.* When an Heretick condemned to be burned is delivered over to the Civil Magistrate, it is with this bitter Taunt and Mock of Tindernesse, *Sir, we passionately desire you, that for the Love of God, and in Regard of Piety, Mercy, and our Mediation, you would free this miserable Person from all Danger of Death, or Mutilation of Members.* But *Panormitanus* on the Decretals informs us, that whatever may be said to the contrary; yet to this End is he delivered to the secular Power, that he may be punished with Death. And *Innoc. VIII.* requires the Magistrate to execute the Sentence within six Days upon Pain of Excommunication, and Loss of Authority.

^e *Ann. 57. §. 32. & §. 33.*

This

This is the general Ground on which they engage: but this indefinite and rambling Superiority of the Priest above the Prince, is a little more orderly gathered up, and made a Present of to the Pope by the *Lateran Council*, A. D. 1213. "If any Lord temporal, required and admonished by the Church, neglect to purge his State from Heretical Filth, let him be excommunicated by the Metropolitan and Conprovincial Bishops: But if he contemn to come to order within one Year's Space, let Relation be made to the supreme Bishop, (meaning Him of *Rome*;) that from thenceforth he may declare all his Subjects to be discharged of their Fealty towards him, and give up his Land to be possessed by Catholics; which Catholics without all Contradiction, when they have driven out the Hereticks, shall have and hold the same, and so preserve it in Purity of Faith." This will a little open our Eyes to discern what the *Roman Catholics* are gaping after in the present Invasion and Rebellion. Their celebrated School-Divine *Aquinas* more expressly, if possible, gives the Supremacy in Temporals to his Holiness. "In the Pope, says he, is the Top of both Powers: when any Prince is denounced excommunicated for Apostacy, his Subjects are immediately freed from their Oath of Allegiance." And elsewhere he determines that the Pope, as supreme King of the World, may impose Taxes, and destroy Towns and Castles for the Preservation of Christianity.[†] And what *Aquinas* asserts with regard to an Apostate Prince, totally renouncing Christianity, his After-commentators

[†] Cap. 3. de Hæret. § Th. 2. Secund. qu. 12. art. 2. & libro 3. de Regim. Princip. cap. 10. & 19.

stretch to every excommunicate Prince; holding that after Excommunication is denounced, his Subjects are bound not to obey him: *except it be for fear of their Lives, or Loss of their temporal Goods, as it was in the Time of Hen. 8.*^b. Agreeably to which Doctrine and prudent Reserve was the Behaviour of the *English* Papists in 1580: For when *Pius 5.* had excommunicated *Q. Elizabeth*, dissolved the Allegiance of her Subjects, and anathematized all who obeyed her; and *Gregory 13.* had ratified the Sentence; they found themselves in an ill Situation betwixt the Pope's Curse, and their Prince's Resentment. In this Dilemma they petitioned *Gregory*, that he would declare the Bull of *Pius* to bind the Queen, and all Hereticks, but not the *Catholicks* in her Dominions, *as Things then stood*; but hereafter only, *when that Bull might be put in publick Execution*^c. Whence we are cautioned not to build too securely on the Sincerity of their Obedience to the present Royal Family; and what They and We are to expect as soon as even these have Power to do us any hurt. And here

The Decisions of another famous Schoolman are necessary to be mentioned, as an Appendix to the Pope's Supremacy, though the Power thereby granted be to the Subject over his Prince. The Substance of which may be thus briefly collected; "It is lawful for a Subject to kill his King, " if he be a Tyrant; i. e. as he explains it, if he " usurp the Crown, or if he govern with Male- " Administration. In the latter Class he ranges " all Protestant Princes, because they are Here-

^b Francis Toletus. cap. 4. Nota, quod eadem ratio est de excommunicato.

^c The Dispensation of *Campion* and *Parsons*.

“ ticks ; for being Hereticks they are *ipso facto* in
 “ some Measure deprived of all Right of their
 “ Dominions. And determines that the Pope,
 “ to whom supreme Princes are subject, may to-
 “ tally and absolutely depose them of all Terri-
 “ tories, and Right to govern : and if they meddle
 “ with the Government, after such Sentence of
 “ the Pope, they become Tyrants by Usurpation
 “ as well as by Male-Administration : and then such
 “ Kings may be dealt with as altogether, and every
 “ Way Tyrants ; and consequently may be killed
 “ by any private Person^k.” Where we learn that
 the Pope of *Rome* so usurps the Power of the Sword,
 as to challenge a Right of putting it into every pri-
 vate Subject’s Hand to assassinate his Prince with.
 But perhaps they *practise* better than they *teach* ;
 and their *Hearts*, it is to be hoped, are honest
 than their *Principles*. Let us then examine

II. Whether their Actions have been conform-
 able to their Doctrine? Betwixt six and seven
 hundred Years ago * we find that furious Prelate
Hildebrand, or *Greg. 7.* laying the Foundation of
 this spiritual Empire ; decreeing, “ that hereafter
 “ no Bishop, Abbot, or Clerk should receive any
 “ Ecclesiastical Benefice at a Layman’s Hands : de-
 “ termining that it was Simony for a Layman to
 “ present to any Benefice ; and subjecting Kings,
 “ Dukes, and Princes who should presume to give
 “ Bishopricks, or other Ecclesiastical Dignities, to
 “ his Censures^l.” The Policy was, that Ecclesia-
 stical Persons being no longer beholden to the State,
 but to the Pope for their Preferments, might in

^k Suarez Defens. Fidei Catholic. advers. Angl. Sect. Er-
 rores cum Respons. ad Apolog. Jacobi Regis.

* A. D. 1074.

^l Platina in Greg. 7.

all Quarrels betwixt Him and their respective Sovereigns, side with the Pope. The Event in many Instances has shewn the Scope and Depth of this Artifice. Nevertheless the Pope himself, even to the Days of this very *Hildebrand*, had his Election confirmed by the Emperor^m. But when *Henry IV.* disdained this Decree, and would not remove his Friends from their Benefices to make Room for the Creatures of *Gregory*, the Pope excommunicated and deposed the Emperor, absolved his Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, and interdicted their Obedience to him. The Factions in *Germany* (which the Pope had taken Care to foment) made it expedient for *Henry* to sue for Absolution: when this arrogant and imperious Prelate made the Emperor, his Queen, and young Prince wait at his Gate, stript of his Royal Robes, barefooted, in extreme Frost and Snow, three Days without Eatingⁿ. This base Submission disgusted the *Italian* Princes under the Emperor, and but swelled the Pope's Haughtiness: to win the Favour of the former, and hopeless of satisfying the Pride of the other, new Occasion was given for another Excommunication, and deposing of the Emperor; in which *Gregory* implores the Assistance of *Peter* and *Paul*, that the World may know, that as they have Power to bind and loose in Heaven, so they have Power on Earth to give and take away Empires, Kingdoms, Principalities, Dukedoms, Earldoms, and the Possessions of all Men^o.

^m The Decrees of *Adrian I.* and *Leo VIII.* give the Emperor the Choice of the Bishop of *Rome*, and the Investiture of Archbishops and Bishops within his Provinces; and deny Power to any of what Degree or Profession soever to choose a Pope, or consecrate a Bishop without Consent of the Emperor.

ⁿ *Lambert of Aschaffenburg*, and *M. Chevreau*.
Excomm. Henr. 4. Romæ 1080.

^o Bulla

In less than a Century afterwards *, the Emperor *Frederick I.* because he would put his Name before the Pope's, and required Homage and Fidelity of the Bishops for their Temporals, was on the Point of Excommunication by *Adrian IV.* when the Pope's Death for that Time prevented it: But the succeeding Pope *Alexander III.* † stirring up the Kings of *Sicily* and *France*, and the States of *Venice*, against the same Emperor, would not make Peace with him, till that Prince had cast his Body prostrate before the Pontiff, and that *Servant of Servants* had set his Foot on the Emperor's Neck, and triumphantly uttered these Words of the Psalmist, *Tbou shalt walk upon the Asp and Basilisk, and thou shalt tread the Lion and Dragon under thy Foot,* PSALM xci. 13.

In the next Century || *Frederick II.* was four several Times deposed by the Bishops of *Rome* ‡. The Remark of the Historian, who lived in the same Age, is, that "some did positively affirm that the Pope, *Innocent IV.* did above all Things earnestly desire to ruin the Emperor *Frederick*, whom he called the Great Dragon, that He being trampled upon, the Kings of *France*, *England*, and other Christian Kings, (whom he called *diminutive Kings*, and *little Serpents*,) affrighted with the sad Fate of *Frederick*, might more easily be kept under, and they and their Prelates spoiled of their Goods, and by him plundered". And *Eberhard*, the grave and venerable Archbishop of *Saltzburg*, at the very time, spoke in this manner to the Nobles and Prelates assembled in

* A. D. 1159. † A. D. 1177. || A. D. 1250.

‡ Once by *Honorius III.* twice by *Gregory IX.* and lastly by *Innocent IV.*

⁂ Matth. Paris. ad ann. 1250.

Germany;

Germany; "Under the Title of chief Bishop, if we be not blind, we see a most cruel Wolf in a Shepherd's Cloak. The Bishops of *Rome* have their Ways and Weapons for all Sorts of Christian Men. By presuming, circumventing, kindling War upon War, they are become great, and now they kill and flea the Sheep, they dispel Peace and Concord from the Face of the Earth, they raise civil Wars and domestic Seditions from the Pit of Hell. . . Christ forbiddeth us to hate our Enemies, chargeth us to love them, to keep Faith with them, and to do Good for their Evil. But the Prelates of *Rome* command us, and that under a jolly Countenance of Piety, to violate that which is holy, to abuse the sacred Name of God to beguile Men with; to be ungrateful to those who have dealt well with us, and to requite good Turns with Evil: yea, to fight, strive, deceive, betray and cozen. They will have us set at nought the Majesty and Providence of God, withstand Nature, and resist the supreme Power that is ordained of God. *Hildebrand* was the first that eightscore and ten Years ago laid the Foundation of Antichrist's Kingdom, under Colour of Religion. This wicked War with Princes he first began, which his Successors have pursued to this Day. Believe me, who have looked into their Doings almost these fifty Years[†]. And as this Pope's Policy to keep our State in Subjection leads us home, let us take a view of their Intrigues and Practices in *England*.

In the same Century *, King *John* refused the Archbishop which the Pope would impose upon

[†] Aventin. Annal. lib. 7.

* A. D. 1213.

him:

him : the Clergy sided with the Pope against their Prince : Divine Service was interdicted to the whole Realm ; and the Pope deposed the King, decreeing that a worthier, by him to be procured, should be placed upon his Throne. *Philip of France* was wrote to, to expel King *John*, on Condition, that after his Expulsion, He and his Heirs should be rightful Owners of the Kingdom of *England*. The King finds his Subjects discontented through the subtle Workings of the Court of *Rome*, and a powerful Invasion stirred up against him : He submits to the Pope, resigns his Crown, that he may receive it again, as Liegeman to the Pope, at the Quit-rent of a thousand Marks yearly*. The Duke, *Philip*, is commanded to desist, on Pain of Excommunication and Deposing, after a prodigious Expence for the Preparation. The Pope had obtained his Ends, and *Philip* must sit down with his Loss. A just Recompence, even in the Judgment of the Court of *Rome*, to Princes who will trample upon their Brother's Rights, to support the Papal Tyranny!

Paul III. †, because our *Henry VIII.* denied him to be Head of the Universal Church, and asserted his own Supremacy in the Government of all his Subjects, who were Members of the Church of *England*, excommunicates, curses, eternally damns, and deposes the said *Henry*, absolves all his Subjects from all Oaths of Allegiance, commands them all under Pain of Excommunication not to obey him, nor any Magistrate or Officer under him ; excom-

* What a considerable Sum will the Arrears for Quitrents amount to, if ever the Pope should have Power to exact Payment ? Besides a Fine, for Renewal of the Grant, at the Will of the Lord.

† A. D. 1535.

municates all his Favourers and Accomplices, and declares Him and Them and *their Descendants* incapable of being Witnesses, making Wills, inheriting, or doing any rightful Act. Where observe, that the Pope's compassionate Indulgence may restore such Witnesses, Testators, Heirs and Agents to their Activity as he thinks proper, and continue the Incapacity to all who make against him. Which would be but agreeable to the Spirit of this very Bull, in which the Pope decrees, that "in any Cause Civil or Criminal, none should be bound to answer the King or his Favourers, and yet they bound to answer every body."

The like Excommunication, deposing, absolving from Allegiance, and forbidding her Subjects in any Case to obey her, was thundered out by *Paul V.* against Queen *Elizabeth**: which was ratified and confirmed by his Successors *Greg. XIII.* and *Sextus Quintus* against the same Princess.

Judging however that the Noise of their Thunder would do no Hurt, unless they hurled the Bolt too; *Paul V.* granted a plenary Indulgence, and Pardon of all Sins, and the Kingdom of Heaven hereafter, and, over and above, two whole Kingdoms on Earth, namely, *England* and *Ireland*, when He could catch them, to *Philip II.* King of *Spain*, to destroy *Q. Elizabeth*. His Successor renewed this Donation of her Kingdoms to the *Spaniard*, and fomented a Rebellion in *Ireland*, constituting one *Fitzgerald*, an *Irish* Rebel, General, to execute by Fire and Sword his Sentence against the

* Et nulli ipsi, sed ipsi aliis superquocunque debito & negotio, tam Civili quam Criminali de jure respondere teneantur. Bull. Pauli III. Romæ 1535.

• A. D. 1570.

Queen. After him, *Sextus Quintus* again renews the Grant to *Spain*; and sends Cardinal *Allen* to get printed at *Antwerp*, and from thence to disperse over *England*, a traiterous and seditious Book, wrote to exhort the *English* and *Irish* Papists, to join with the *Spanish* Forces against their Queen and Country: and upon this Pope's Errand the boasted *Invincible Armado* was dispatched *.

Nor were Princes only roused up, but private Ruffians and Assassins hired, some Foreigners, and some her own Subjects, to rid them of this Princess. In 1583 several seditious Pamphlets were scattered about, prompting the Queen's Maids of Honour to serve their Mistress as *Judith* did *Holofernes*: By which Instigations, and those of one *Hall* a Priest, Mr. *Somerville* attempted to kill the Queen in her Apartments. In 1585, Dr. *Parry*, a Member of Parliament, confessed that he had held Correspondence with the Pope's Nuncios, and Cardinals, and Jesuits; that he was stirred up to kill the Queen; and that to accomplish his Design, he confessed his Conspiracy, the better to obtain Confidence and Opportunity: that he regretted his Treason, and laid aside his Dagger whenever he waited on the Queen, lest he should be tempted to murder her: that afterwards by reading Cardinal *Allen's* Book beforementioned, he swore to execute his first Design with *Nevil*, who betrayed him. In 1586, *John Savage* made the same desperate Attempt, moved thereto by the same Engines. And, to omit many others, there were no less than three several Engagements to this Purpose in the Year 1594. One by *Patrick Cullen*, an *Irish* Fencing-Master, sent over from the Low Countries

* A. D. 1588.

on this Christian Errand. Another by *Roderigo Lopez*, the Queen's Physician, with *Stephen Ferrira Gama*, and *Emanuel Loisse*, two *Portuguese*, hired for 50,000 Ducats to poison her. And afterwards, *Edward York* and *Richard Williams* engaged, at the Instigation of the Jesuits, and for their Assignment of 40,000 Ducats, to dispatch this Business *.

But enough has been said to prove their Practices as bad as their Principles. Ravenous Wolves when in Power, and venomous Vipers where too weak! Sworn, devoted Foes to Protestant Kings and their Subjects; whose Religion destroys their Loyalty, and whose Zeal extinguishes Humanity: Whom the mildest Treatment cannot make relent, nor the most solemn Oaths can bind! Rebellion is their Duty; Fire and Faggot their Charity; Plunder, Tortures, Assassinations, and Destructions their most meritorious Piety, by which they think that they do God Service †! In *Q. Mary's* short Reign 400 are reported by some, and twice the Number by others to have suffered for their Religion. In the Time of *James I.* they aimed at more compendious Ruin, the Nation at a Blow, by their Powder-Plot. In *Charles I's* Reign the *Irish* Papists massacred 40,000 Protestants in two Days. In *James II's* short Administration of less than four Years, what amazing Advances were made to subvert our Constitution in Church and State, after the most solemn and repeated Promises to protect both! His Royal Word stood engaged to breed a fatal Security, and then he treache-

* *Camden's Elizabeth.* † In the fourth *Lateran* Council 1215. those who fought against the *Waldenses* were promised a plenary Pardon of all their Sins, and a greater Degree of Glory hereafter.

roully abused the Nation's Confidence, to make it an Instrument of their Ruin; dispensing with the Laws, acting contrary to them, trampling on the Great Charter of *English* Liberty, in order to subject his People to a foreign Yoke. And as his Heirs were Protestants, it was violently suspected, that to defraud Them, and rivet the Yoke to our Necks, he created, what God denied him, a Son to inherit. A miraculous Birth! the Issue of the Dutcheſs of *Modena's* Prayers to the Lady of *Loretto*, and known to be a Son eight Months before he was born! The Apprehensions of an Imposture were publick before the pretended Delivery of the Queen; and no legal Means used to satisfy the People. The authentic Judgment of the Nation considered him when born, as supposititious, as they sufficiently declared by taking no Notice of him in the Succession. Their Judgment at a Time so near the Fact, should determine ours at so great a Distance from it. Be it, that the Truth of the Fact required such mysterious Management; or, that an imperious Spirit disdained to give the proper Evidence; in either Case, in a civil Light we cannot but look upon it as an Imposture. And shall we send to *Rome* for a Slip of this inserted Graff! Shall we, like simple Lambs, hold up our Throats, and kiss the Butcher's Hand that comes to slay us? Shall we sacrifice our happy Constitution in Church and State, the Price and Purchase of our Ancestors Blood, of Martyrs and of Patriots who have bequeathed it to us, and exchange it for the Absurdities and Idolatries of a corrupt Church, for the Cruelties and arbitrary Government of a Popish Tyrant? But let us see

III. With what Scriptures they colour this Doctrine of the Pope's Supremacy over Kings and their
F
Subjects.

Subjects. When they plead their Rights, they must be supposed in common Prudence, to produce their most authentick Grants. These I think are but Two;

1. *Peter's Power*: *Pius V.* begins his Bull against *Q. Elizabeth* in this Manner: "He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all Power in Heaven and on Earth, committed one Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church to one alone upon Earth, namely to *Peter*, the Prince of the Apostles, and to *Peter's* Successor the Bishop of *Rome*, to be governed in *Fulness of Power*." The Argument runs thus; Christ has all Power given him in Heaven, and on Earth: Christ gave this *Fulness* of his Power to *Peter*: *Peter* devolved the same to the Bishop of *Rome*. These bold Assertions have been already considered, and refuted; the Bishop of *Rome's* Succession to *Peter* is very precarious; his succeeding to his full Power, false; *Peter's* equal Power with Christ, and Superiority over the other Apostles disproved; and even Christ himself to *Pilate* protests against any Claim to kingly Power upon Earth; *My Kingdom is not of this World*, JOHN xviii. 36. But lest they should not be able to derive sufficient Power from *Peter*, they join another Fountain to draw from: Therefore

2. The next Words are, "Him alone he made Prince over all People, and all Kingdoms, to pluck up, destroy, scatter, consume, plant and build." Which Words refer to God's Commission given to *Jeremiah*; See, *I have this Day set thee over the Nations, and over the Kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant*, Chap. i. 10. Several other Popes make Use of the same Text for the same

Purpose⁷. If *Peter's* Acquisitions be too small for their Inheritance, they can carry their Pedigree higher, and prove themselves the spiritual Descendants in a right Line from the Prophet *Jeremiab*. So *Alexander III.* expressly informs us, that the Power over Nations and Kingdoms, to pull up, cast down, and destroy, was given to *Jeremy*, and in him to the Evangelical Priest, the *Roman Pontiff*⁸. They are excellent Heralds, and where any thing is to be got in Heaven or on Earth, find no Difficulty in claiming Kindred, and deducing their Right to it. However, it must be acknowledged, several believe, that though this Text fail him, yet he can support his Claim to supreme temporal Power by the Evidence of Scripture: Not derived from Christ through the Line of Prophets and Apostles, but from the Prince of this World, JOHN xii. 31. *The Dragon gave him his Power, and his Seat, and great Authority. And there was given unto him a Mouth speaking great Things and Blasphemies. And it was given unto him to make War with the Saints, and to overcome them: And Power was given him over all Kindreds, and Tongues, and Nations, Rev. xiii. 2, 5, 7.* This is his most authentick Title; but his Claim from *Jeremiab* is exceeding weak. We can trace no manner of Relation that the Bishop of Rome has to that Prophet; nor need he give himself any Trouble about proving it, for *Jeremy* himself had no such Power as the Pope would establish by virtue of this Commission. He was not invested with imperial Power to depose Kings and Emperors; no, he patiently sub-

⁷ Alex. III. Innocent III. Bonif. VIII. Paul III.

⁸ Constitut. 9. Alex. 3.

mitted to their Authority, was imprisoned by them, ill treated, and at last murdered ^a: But he was commissioned with *prophetical* Power to threaten and preach God's Judgments of Ruin and Desolation to wicked Nations and Kingdoms, who would not obey him; and to promise God's Blessings and Protection to such as did. This is the Meaning of the Text, even according to their own Expositors ^b. And this leads us

IV. To enquire what the Scriptures, and Primitive Christians taught on this Point. There we shall find, that as *Jeremy* had no such Commission of drawing the Sword, to pull down and destroy, and to fight against Kings: so neither did Christ give it to *Peter*; but expressly interdicted the Use of the Sword to him, when, in an intemperate Zeal, he had cut off the High-Priest's Servant's Ear; *Peter, put up thy Sword into the Sheath*, JOHN xviii. 11. And *Peter's* Instructions breathe another Spirit from that which blows from *Rome*; *Submit yourselves to every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's Sake: whether it be to the King, as supreme; or unto Governors, as unto them that are sent by him; for the Punishment of evil Doers, and for the Praise of them that do well*, 1 PET. ii. 13, 14. And should the Civil Power oppress Particulars, and their Religion, he teaches patient Submission; *If any Man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this Behalf*, Chap. iv. 16. Not to intermeddle with what belongs not to him, the Swords and Diadems of Princes; *Let none of you suffer—as a busy Body in other Men's Matters*, ver.

^a Ita Hieronym. Tertull. Doroth. Epiphani. Isidor.

^b Corn. a Lapide, and others.

15. *But to feed the Flock of God, not lording it over God's Heritage*, Chap. v. 2, 3. These are Christian Apostolical Lessons, which the Successors of St. Peter would do well to con by heart. In the same Strain teaches St. Paul; He forbids a Bishop to be a Striker, 1 TIM. iii. 3. commits the Sword to the Prince, ROM. xiii. 4. and enjoins every Soul to be subject to the Higher Powers, ver. 1. There is no Exemption of Ecclesiasticks; he never dreamed of the Romish Divinity, that "the Clergy are so sacred, that it is impossible they should be subject to Princes;" and that "if They rebel it is no Treason." Much less did he set the Priest above the Prince, or subject all Nations to the Tyranny of the Bishop of Rome. As Christ and his Apostles taught, so taught the Christian Fathers; "Be he Priest, Bishop, or Monk, let them be subject to Magistrates," say the Commentators for a thousand Years. Even after the Popes had began to exercise this extravagant Power, Barnard writes to Eugenius III. and warns him not to give so much Time and Study in secular Affairs as his Predecessors had done: "Go thou then and usurp, if thou dare, either an Apostleship if thou be a Prince, or Dominion if thou be Apostolick. Thou art expressly forbidden both. The Pattern of an Apostle is this; Dominion is interdicted, Service is enjoined." If we proceed farther, and consider

V. The *Practice* of the Primitive Church; it is notoriously evident that for the first 300 Years the Bishops of Rome were subject to Pagan Princes.

* Cajetan in 22. Quæst. 99. §. ad quintum Dubium, p. 247.

† Eman. Sa. Aphorism. Confess. verbo Clericus.

‡ A. D. 1149.

And the latter ones pretend to no temporal Jurisdiction till the Magistrates became Christian; till they took the Church into their Protection, till *Kings became it's nursing Fathers, and Queens it's nursing Mothers.* From this Time they would date their Supremacy. Preposterous Frowardness! for the Child to threaten and correct it's Nurse! Monstrous Ingratitude! to depose and murder Princes, because they have protected and endowed the Church! But the Bishops of *Rome* were not such Miscreants at first, nor aimed at such Authority.

Constantine, the First Christian Emperor *, acted in Ecclesiastical Matters with supreme Power. He gave free Liberty to the Profession of the Christian Religion; he prohibited Pagan Idolatries; would not tolerate the Conventicles of Hereticks; deprived them of the Privileges, which he granted to his Catholick Subjects; called Councils; attended their Debates; confirmed their Decrees; and deposed Bishops †.

About 200 Years after †, *Justinian* the Emperor, collecting the Laws of his Predecessors, relating to the Christian Faith, Churches and Bishops, Hereticks and Apostates, and other Ecclesiastical Points, declares, “ Our chiefeſt Care is for the
“ Truth of God's Doctrine, and seemly Converſa-
“ tion of the Clergy. The Things then that we
“ have decreed and make for the Preservation of
“ the ſacred Order and State, conſonant to the
“ Tenor of holy Rules, let the moſt godly Pa-
“ triarchs of every Dioceſe, the Metropolitans and
“ Right Reverend Bishops and Clerks keep for e-

* A. D. 330.

† A. D. 531.

† Eusebius and Socrates,

“ver hereafter inviolable; the Breaker of them
 “shall be sure to be sequestered utterly from God,
 “and excluded from his Priestly Function.”

In the next Century *, *Machiavel* in his History of *Florence*, dedicated to Pope *Clement VII.* remarks, “about this Time the Bishops of *Rome* began to take upon them, and to exercise greater
 “Authority than they had formerly done—till the
 “coming in of the *Lombards*, all *Italy* being under the Dominion either of Emperors or Kings,
 “the Bishops assumed no more Power than what
 “was due to their Doctrine and Manners; in Civil Affairs they were subject to the Civil Power,
 “employ’d many times by their Emperors and
 “Kings, as their Ministers; and many Times executed for their ill Administration.” In this Century the Pope’s Influence and Authority grew by these Means; the Emperor’s Power had been too much weakened by the Troubles and Invasions in *Italy*, to be absolute at *Rome*: the Invaders, the *Lombards*, had dissipated their own Strength by dividing their Kingly Power among thirty Dukes. At this Juncture the Pope assumed the Government of *Rome* to himself, and by sometimes siding with one, and sometimes the other, supported himself against the Power of each. Afterwards, when the Emperor was too much engaged against the *Persian*, the *Saracen*, and the *Turk*, to yield him Assistance, the Pope was left exposed to the unbalanced Power of the *Lombards*, who made War against him. He then applies to *Pepin*, King of *France* †, who beat the *Lombards*; and

* Novell. Constitut. 6.

† Machiavel lib. i.

* A. D. 600.

† A. D. 740.

possessing himself of all the Lands belonging to the Exarchat of *Ravenna*, the Country of *Urbino* and *La Marca*, bestowed them upon the Pope. Thus he grew into a temporal Prince, but not yet to be King of Kings; or to claim a Supremacy in the Churches under other Princes.

For even *Charles* the Great of *France* †, on whom now the Western Empire was devolved, the chief Patron of the Papacy, who first exempted the Pope from Man's Jurisdiction, yet maintained his own Supremacy over Ecclesiastical Persons and Causes within his own Dominions. He made Laws directing in Matters of Doctrine, Administration of the Sacraments, Divine Service, the Duties of Bishops and Priests: and says, "If there were any other Ecclesiastical Matters worthy to be redressed, he would by God's Help, and the Advice of faithful People, as Opportunity served, determine the same."

His Successors *Lewis* and *Lotharius* * support the same Supremacy in their Laws; urging the Example of their Progenitors, who made the Honour of God's Holy Church their principal Study, which they, for their Part, profess also to do, as it had pleased God to appoint them that they should have the Care of his Holy Church, and that Realm. "And as the Chief of this Ministry—we will you All, without Exception, to observe our Commandment in all Things; and to honour all such as we send for any Occasion or Business, either Ecclesiastical or temporal, and in respect of our Authority not to fail Obedience!"

† A. D. 800.

* A. D. 850.

‡ Legum Franciæ. cap. 11. 12. Lib. 2.

These were the Pope's great Patrons and Builders up: who, you see, maintain Supremacy over Ecclesiastical Persons and Causes within their own Territories: which not only by *Implication* excludes the Pope in those Territories, but we shall find *express* Proof that even the Pope himself was *subject to the Emperor*, so low as *Lotharius* last mentioned. I shall pass over the several Bishops of *Rome*, who were banished by several of the former Emperors, and the Acknowledgment of *Gregory* the Great to the Emperor *Mauritius*^{*}, as only Instances of a Subjection already proved in the preceding Ages.

Pope *Leo IV.* writes thus to the Emperor *Louis*:
 " If we have done any Thing otherwise than well
 " . . . we will amend all that is amiss by the Judg-
 " ment of your Highness: beseeching your Ex-
 " cellency to send, for the better Trial of these
 " Surmises, such as in the Fear of God may nar-
 " rowly sift, not only the Matters informed, but
 " all, great and small, as well as if your Majesty
 " was present." And the same Pope to the Em-
 " peror *Lotharius* professes, " The Imperial Precepts
 " of your Highness, and the Princes your Prede-
 " cessors, irrefragably to be kept and obeyed, we
 " by all Means profess, that we will by Christ's
 " Help, now and for ever observe."

Thus

^{*} This Acknowledgment was made with regard to certain Edicts given forth by the Emperor, but disapproved by the Pope. *Gregory's* Behaviour in this nice Case determines the Point as to that Age, about A. D. 600. " What am I, says he, that
 " speak to my Lord, but Dust and a very Worm? Yet for that
 " this Edict tendeth against God the Creator of all Things, I
 " cannot conceal so much from my Lord. I therefore beseech
 " you by the dreadful Judge, that your Holiness (so he calls
 " the Emperor) would either mitigate or abrogate this rigo-
 " roua

Thus the Prince's Supremacy over Ecclesiastical Persons and Things continued in the Western Empire 850 Years, near half the Time that Christianity has appeared. In the East, the Emperors maintained it longer; as long as they maintained their Empire.

We will now revert, and trace the Point of Supremacy in this particular Kingdom. The first Christian King of it, *Lucius*, is allowed in a Letter from the Pope, to be God's Vicar in his own Kingdom*. From which Time there is little significant to be observed till the Days of

Augustine the Monk†, who was sent over by *Gregory* the Great¹, to convert the *Saxons* in this Kingdom. This Legate waited in the Isle of *Thanet* till he had obtained King *Esbelbert*'s Leave to come into his Kingdom. *Wales* was then Christian; *Augustine* desired a Conference with their Bishops and Monks, and proposed their Submission to the See of *Rome* in *Spirituals*: They protested against any Obedience due to the Bishop of *Rome*, or to *Augustine* as their Archbishop, having an Archbishop of their own. They therefore denied the Pope's Supremacy both in *Spirituals* and *Temporals*, and died in Defence of their Liberty". And for

" rous Proclamation. I, for my Part, as subject to your Com-
 " mandment, have sent your Precept into sundry Coasts: Yet
 " because your Law doth not stand with God's Glory, so, by
 " Letters I have acquainted my most glorious Lord therewith.
 " So that I have either Way done my Duty: who have both
 " yielded Obedience to my Prince, and in God's Behalf disburdened
 " my Conscience."

* A. D. 170. † A. D. 601.

¹ Of whom see Note before.

* Some Historians, says *Du Pin*, do accuse *Augustine* the Monk of having had a Hand in the Massacre of those poor
Britains,

for a long Time after, the *Old British Churches* kept themselves free from the Government of the *New English Churches*; till at length, and by Degrees the latter, under the Influences and Alliances of *France* and *Rome*, prevailed against the former; and the Papal Power gradually struck Root in these Kingdoms: But not yet so far as to thrust out the Regal. For in the Laws of *Edward* the Confessor*, which *William* the Conqueror confirmed†, the King's Office is thus expressed; "A King, " because he is the Lieutenant of the Most High " King, was appointed to this End, that he should " regard and govern the earthly Kingdom, and " the People of God, and above all Things the " Holy Church of this Kingdom, with all Integrity " and Liberty according to the Constitutions of " his Fathers and Predecessors, and to defend it " against Enemies". This is the more observable in *William*, as he was put upon the Conquest of *England* by *Hildebrand*, then Archdeacon of *Rome*; who, when soon after Pope, by the Name of *Gregory VII.* required *William* to give his Oath of Fidelity to the Holy See. Which Oath the King absolutely refused, because his Predecessors had never done it. He farther prohibited his Subjects to acknowledge any Pope without his Leave, and to receive any Bulls from *Rome* till they were shewn to him; neither would he suffer the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, though styled Primate of all *England*,

Britains, who did not deserve such hard Usage, by Reason they maintained their ancient Custom, and the Liberties of their Churches without deviating from the Catholick Faith, Cent. 7. Eccl. Hist.

* A. D. 1041.

† A. D. 1066.

• Inter leges Edw. cap. 17. de Regis officio.

to

to make any Constitutions in his Councils without his Leave ; and forbid that any of his Barons, Lords, Ministers of State, or Officers should be communicated without his Order*.

William Rufus, Son to the Conqueror*, forbid any Archbishop or Bishop of his Realm to be subject to the Pope or Court of *Rome*, since he had all those Liberties in his Kingdom, which the Emperor had in the Empire.

His Brother and Successor *Henry I.* † forbid *Anselm*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, who had fled to *Rome*, to enter the Land on his Return, unless he would faithfully promise to keep the Constitutions of *William* the Conqueror, and *William Rufus* his Brother.

In his Grandson *Henry II's* Reign‡, a general Assembly was held at *Clarendon*, when the Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, Priors, Clergy, Earls, Barons, and Nobles swore to observe the Constitutions of *Henry I.* among the rest This in particular : “ No
“ Archbishop, Bishop, or any other Person of this
“ Realm may go out of the Land without the
“ King's Leave. For Appeals, if any be made,
“ they shall come from the Archdeacon to the Bi-
“ shop, and from the Bishop to the Archbishop ;
“ and if the Archbishop fail in doing Justice, it
“ shall be lawful to come last of all to the King,
“ that by his Commandment the Matter may be
“ ended in the Archbishop's Court : so that no
“ Man shall proceed to appeal any farther without
“ the King's Consent.” It is true, the Pope, and his Archbishop *Becket* struggled against it.

* Dupin. Cent. 11.

† A. D. 1106.

* A. D. 1090.

‡ A. D. 1163.

How his Son *John* was assaulted *, and deprived of his Crown by the Pope, and became Feudatory to *Rome*, you have heard already. An Injury which the Barons of *England* would not submit to, but protested against, as did even Cardinal *Langton* himself.

On this Pretence indeed the Pope † called the King of *England* his Vassal, nay his Slave and Property ‡; and sent to *Edward III.* ¶ to pay his Arrears of Tribute, and to do him Homage †. But the King and his Realm in open Popish Parliament made a general Association, with all their Might to withstand Excommunications and Censures coming from *Rome* for Matters decided in the King's Courts, or belonging to the Laws and Royal Liberties †.

As they did also in his Successors Time *Richard II.* § complaining of Processes and Excommunications by the Bishop of *Rome* to the open Dishonour of the Crown, and Destruction of their Sovereign Lord the King, his Law, and all his Realm; so as the Crown of *England*, which had been so free at all Times, that it hath been in Subjection to no Realm, but immediately subject to God, and to none other in all Things touching the Regality of the same Crown,—should be submitted to the Bishop of *Rome*, and the Laws and Statutes of the Realm by him defeated and destroyed at his Will, a perpetual Destruction of the King, his Crown, and all his Realm †. Against which Usurpations,

* A. D. 1213.

† A. D. 1250.

‡ *Innocent IV.*

¶ Making of *Henry III.*

§ A. D. 1325.

† *John xxii.*

† *Coke's Institut. part. 4. c. 1.*

§ A. D. 1391.

† *Polydore Virgil in Rich. 2.*

that

that *Popish*, but *English* Parliament plighted their Faith to defend their Sovereign. They did not think Allegiance to their Prince inconsistent with the Duty and Religion of an *English* Papist: I hope those of our own Nation, who retain the same Religion, will likewise retain the same Loyalty to their Prince, and Affection to their Country. But most infamous will it be in *Protestants*, to court this insupportable Yoke again, to betray the *English* Liberties to *Roman* Tyranny, and to be even more *Popish* in their Disaffection, than *Papists* themselves.

For the preventing any Misapprehensions, it may be convenient

Lastly, to state in few Words the Prince's Supremacy, and the People's Obedience.

The King is not supreme, or above the *Universal Church*, for that consists of Men and of Angels; nor above the *Church Militant* on Earth, for that contains *all* the Faithful of all Countries wherever dispersed: But with regard to the *particular Church* within the Limits of his Territories the Prince is supreme over all his Subjects, Clergy as well as Laity; and in all Causes, Ecclesiastical, as well as Civil.

Farther, this Supremacy is not over *the Faith*, so as that the Prince may impose a New One; not over *Christian Duties*, so as that a Prince may dissolve them, or dispense with their Obligation; not over *the Means of Grace*, so as that a Prince may institute new Sacraments, or abrogate those instituted by Christ: For the *Reasons and Motives* to believe, *the Obligations* to act, and *the Benefits* to be received depend upon a higher Power, and cannot be subject to the Jurisdiction of earthly Prince or Priest. Both of them indeed are God's Ministers, appointed

appointed to preserve and continue his Church; yet with a Power not at all *divided* betwixt them, but totally *distinct* and independent. The Prince receives not his Power from the Priest, nor the Priest His from the Prince. The first derives from God by the Ordinance of Man; the latter from Christ by successive Delegation. The Government of the one is *external*, commanding the Actions of the Body; the Government of the other is *internal*, directing the Motions of the Soul.

To the Prince is committed *the Sword*; to which Sword commanding for Truth, Bishops and Priests, as well as Laity, must be subject; and the same Sword, should it take Part with Error, They must patiently endure; as our Martyrs under Queen *Mary* did, requiring and exhorting all the Queen's Subjects by their Example, rather to give their Heads to the Block, than in any Point to rebel. Yet this precludes not from the Use of such legal Appeals, tolerated dissent, or other just Means of Redress, as the particular Constitutions of the State we live under, direct or allow. But Individuals must not, on the Score of Religion, rebel against their Prince.

To the Priest is committed *the Word and Sacraments*; He may exhort, reprove, and reject from Communion, Prince as well as Subject: But with regard both to One and the Other, in such Godly Wisdom and Discretion, as not to *endanger*, but to *save* their Souls, and the Souls of others. And his Commission gives him no coercive Power over the Persons or the Goods of either.

* The Declaration of about 12 Bishops. *Fox's Martyns*. Vol. III. p. 101.

If any doubtful, not seditious, Enquirer should ask, How this Doctrine of the Prince's Supremacy over all Persons and Causes, as well Ecclesiastical as Civil, was maintained at the Close of the present Claimant's pretended Father's Reign? I shall in Answer lay before him the Judgment of a very celebrated Politician; one, not interested in the Factions of that Day, for he wrote above 200 Years ago: nor prejudiced against a Popish Government, for he was himself a Papist. "Whosoever, says he, takes up Arms to maintain the Politick Constitution, or Government of his Country, in the Condition it then is, I mean, to defend it from being changed, or invaded, by the Craft or Force of any Man (although it be the Prince, or chief Magistrate himself) provided, that such taking up of Arms be commanded or authorised by those who are, by the Orders of that Government, legally intrusted with the Custody of the Liberty of the People, and Foundation of the Government: This I hold to be so far from Rebellion, that I believe it laudable, nay the Duty of every Member of such Common-wealth; for that he who fights to support, and defend the Government he was born and lives under, cannot deserve the odious Name of Rebel, but He who endeavours to destroy it. If this be not granted, it will be in vain to frame any *mixed Monarchies* in the World, wherein the Prince hath his Share, and the People theirs; which last, if they had no Means of recovering their Rights, if taken from them, or defending them, if invaded, would be in the same Estate as if they had no Title to them, but lived under the Empire of *Turkey*, or of *Muscovy*."

If this Opinion be discredited, for the Sake of it's Author, as irreligious, or because given by a Foreigner and Stranger to our Constitution, I shall add that of a Protestant *English* Bishop, who cannot be suspected of any Prejudice in the Case of *the Revolution*, having wrote an hundred Years before it; nor of Disaffection to the Princess then upon the Throne, to whom he was a faithful and a favoured Subject. "If a Prince, says he, should go about
 "to subject his Kingdom to a foreign Realm, or
 "change the Form of the Commonwealth from
 "Imperie (or just Government) to Tyranny; or
 "neglect the Laws established by common Consent of Prince and People, to execute his own
 "Pleasure: In *these*, and other Cases which might
 "be named, if the Nobles and Commons join together to defend their ancient and accustomed
 "Liberty, Regiment and Laws, they may not
 "well be counted Rebels *."

By maintaining, and submitting to such Regal Supremacy, we shall shew ourselves Good *Christians*, Sound *Protestants*, and True *Englishmen*. Fear God, and Honour the King, are the Principles of the *British* Constitution; and as the present Occasion demands of us to unite what have been too long divided, let us improve the Opportunity, and restore those Springs to their due Activity. Other Systems will deceive those who frame them, and end in a general Confusion: It will be a fatal Experiment to try, whether a Kingdom of *the Prophane* can subsist by the Influences of *Corruption*; *Infidelity* is unconcerned about the Change of Creeds, and *Mercenaries* set their Allegiance to sale

* *Bishop's* true Difference between Christian Subjection, and Unchristian Rebellion. p. 520.

to the best Bidder. But where Religion and Loyalty warm every Heart, they arm every Hand. The Peasant, who has no Property to defend, has yet a dearer Interest to contend for under the present Establishment; and the Subject, who obeys for Conscience Sake, can be tempted with no Equivalent. He who fears God, will not leave our Reformation to wallow again in the Corruptions of Rome; nor, He who honours the King, be basely bought to desert him for a Tyrant. That this Faith may long flourish under the present Defender of it,

Be thou still, O Lord, our mighty Protector, and scatter our Enemies that delight in Blood. Infatuate and defeat their Counsels, abate their Pride, assuage their Malice and confound their Devices. Strengthen the Hands of our Gracious Sovereign KING GEORGE, and all that are put in Authority under him, with Judgment and Justice, to cut off all such Workers of Iniquity, as turn Religion into Rebellion, and Faith into Faction; that they may never prevail against us, or triumph in the Ruin of thy Church among us: But that our Gracious Sovereign and his Realms, being preserved in thy true Religion, and by thy merciful Goodness protected in the same, we may all daily serve thee, and give thee Thanks in thy Holy Congregation, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

F I N I S.

Lately published by the Reverend Mr. RIDLEY.

1. *Eight Sermons on the Divinity and Operations of the Holy Ghost, preached at the Cathedral of St. Paul in London, in the Years 1740 and 1741, at the Lecture founded by the worthy Lady Moyer deceased. Price 4s. 6d.*

2. *The Christian Passover: four Sermons, in which the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper is laid down according to the whole Tenor of Scripture, and the general Consent of Antiquity. Preached in Lent 1736. Second Edit. Price 1s.*